FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-175
Monday
10 September 1990

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-175 *10 September 1990*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Correction to Arms Control Reporting 1

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Genscher, Shevardnadze Confident of Signing Accord *[East Berlin TV]* 2
Genscher on USSR Demands, Price of Unification *[Hamburg DPA]* 2
Shevardnadze Interviewed on Asia-Pacific Region *[TRUD 9 Sep]* 2
Comparison of Shevardnadze's Vladivostok Speech 4

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Helsinki Summit Reports Focus on Gorbachev 7
Arrives in Helsinki 8 Sep *[TASS]* 7
Makes Brief Arrival Statement *[Moscow Radio]* 7
Thanks Residents for Welcome *[Moscow TV]* 7
Meets With Finnish President *[TASS]* 7
Bush Issues Statement Upon Arrival in Helsinki *[PRAVDA 9 Sep]* 8
Gorbachev, Bush Begin Consultations 9 Sep 8
Discuss Gulf Situation *[PRAVDA 10 Sep]* 8
Issue Joint Statement *[PRAVDA 10 Sep]* 8
Hold News Conference *[Moscow TV]* 9
Gorbachev, Aides Depart 9 Sep *[TASS]* 13
Bush Satisfied With Talks *[TASS]* 13
Gorbachev's Evaluations of Summit Reported 13
'Optimistic' About Talks *[TASS]* 13
Labels Meeting 'Substantive' *[Moscow Radio]* 13
Interviewed on Results *[Moscow Radio]* 14
Moscow TV Reports Assessments of Summit 15
PRAVDA Sees 'New Stage' in Relations *[10 Sep]* 17
Officials View Summit in Light of Gulf Crisis 18
Shevardnadze Views Agenda *[TASS]* 18
Bush Aide Praises Soviet Role *[TASS]* 18
Finnish Leader on Hostages *[TASS]* 18
Official Expectations of Helsinki Summit Noted 19
French Leader Sees 'Solidarity' *[IZVESTIYA 8 Sep]* 19
UK's Thatcher Wishes Success *[TASS]* 19
Pre-Summit Commentaries View U.S., Soviet Aims 19
Bush Awaits 'Active Support' *[IZVESTIYA 7 Sep]* 19
Issues More Complex Now *[IZVESTIYA 8 Sep]* 20
'Powerful Stabilizing Factor' *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 8 Sep]* 22
Concern Over Gulf Shared *[Moscow International]* 23
'Emergency Meeting' Previewed *[TRUD 8 Sep]* 26
'New Quality' of Ties Seen *[Kondrashov in IZVESTIYA 9 Sep]* 27
Many Issues To Be Resolved *[Kolesnichenko in PRAVDA 9 Sep]* 28

China

Shevardnadze To Meet With Chinese Counterpart *[Moscow International]* 29
PRC Seeks Cooperation in Gold Mining *[TASS]* 30
Commentary Examines Chinese Border Disputes *[Nikolayev on Moscow International]* 30

Northeast Asia

Shevardnadze Holds News Conference in Tokyo 30
Calls Talks 'Positive' *[Moscow Radio]* 30
Discusses Kurils Dispute *[TRUD 8 Sep]* 31
IZVESTIYA Interviews Shevardnadze on Visit *[9 Sep]* 32
Commentaries Review Shevardnadze's Japan Visit 34
Kuril Proposals Forwarded *[Moscow International]* 34
'Optimistic View' of Relations *[Moscow International]* 34
Comparison of Soviet-Japanese Statement on Iraq 35
PRAVDA Editor Receives Japanese Lawmakers *[PRAVDA 7 Sep]* 35
Reportage Continues on North-South Korean Ties 35
'A Long Way' to Unity *[IZVESTIYA 6 Sep]* 35
Single UN Entry Discussed *[Moscow International]* 36
'Mistrust' Still Plays Role *[Moscow International]* 37

Near East & South Asia

Secretary Baker Meets With Middle East Leaders 38
Confers With Saudi King *[TASS]* 38
Meets With Mubarak in Cairo *[IZVESTIYA 10 Sep]* 38
Iraq's Saddam Issues Warning to Gorbachev, Bush *[TASS]* 39
Kuwaiti Amir Appeals to Superpower Leaders *[TASS]* 39
TASS Notes Kuwaiti Gratitude for Gulf Stand 39
Egypt Expresses 'Indignation' at Saddam's Call *[IZVESTIYA 8 Sep]* 40
Shevardnadze Ready 'To Try To Resolve' Crisis *[Jerusalem Radio]* 40
Tunisia's 'Special Envoy' Zouari Visits Moscow 40
Received by Belousov 7 Sep *[TASS]* 40
Meets With Shevardnardze 8 Sep *[TASS]* 40
Belonogov Meets With Ambassadors, Reviews Gulf 41
Meets Indian, Italian Envoys *[IZVESTIYA 6 Sep]* 41
Receives Matlock 7 Sep *[TASS]* 41
Meets With UK's Braithwaite *[IZVESTIYA 9 Sep]* 41
Receives Libya's Farjani *[IZVESTIYA 10 Sep]* 41
Confers With Iranian Envoy *[Tehran IRNA]* 41
Gerasimov Calls for 'Collective Actions' in Gulf *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA No 35]* 41
Reasons for Arab Support of Saddam Explored *[IZVESTIYA 7 Sep]* 42
Results of Poll on Gulf Crisis Published *[MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI No 35]* 43
Iranian View of Crisis, Iraqi Actions Described *[IZVESTIYA 5 Sep]* 43
Commentary Urges Review of Palestinian Issue *[Moscow International]* 44

Sub-Saharan Africa

South African Party 'Propaganda' Discussed *[Fedorov on Moscow International]* 44
Commentary Views Arrests of Zanzibar Dissidents *[Moscow International]* 45

West Europe

Gorbachev, Kohl Examine 'Pressing' Issues *[TASS]* 46
Kohl Invites Gorbachev, Bush to Visit 3 Oct *[TASS]* 46
Shevardnadze Confers With Finnish Counterpart *[TASS]* 46
Baltic Environment Discussed *[Helsinki Domestic Service]* 46
Gorbachev To Receive Italian Prize Personally *[Moscow Radio]* 46
Yakovlev Meets Visiting Swedish Delegation *[Moscow TV]* 46

Latin America & Caribbean

Cuban Vice Minister Cited on Soviet Aid *[MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI 2 Sep]* 47

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet

Lukyanov Chairs Supreme Soviet Presidium Meeting *[Moscow Radio]* 49
Lukyanov Holds News Conference on Supreme Soviet 49
Agenda, Work Procedure Finalized *[Moscow Radio]* 49
Session Seen as Stabilizing Factor *[TASS]* 49
Shift to Market Economy Main Issue *[Moscow TV]* 50
Yakovlev Optimistic Despite 'Negative Processes' *[TASS]* 50
Radio, TV Coverage of Supreme Soviet Detailed
[GOVORIT I POKAZYVAYET MOSKVA 10-16 Sep] 51

Political & Social

Gorbachev Party Returns to Moscow From Helsinki *[TASS]* 51
Moscow Radio Predicts Ryzhkov Will Resign *[Moscow International]* 51
Union Treaty Consultations Held in Kremlin *[SOYUZ No 33]* 52
KGB Plans To Open 'Press Center' 11 Sep *[TASS]* 53
Academic on Restoring Right to Political 'Victims' *[Moscow Radio]* 54
PRAVDA's Role in Renewed Society Discussed *[Moscow TV]* 54
Party Newspapers Receive Registration Documents *[PRAVDA 7 Sep]* 55
Status of ZNAMYA Magazine Still Unresolved *[IZVESTIYA 5 Sep]* 55
Parents of Deceased Servicemen Demand Changes *[Moscow Radio]* 55
Scientists Register 541 People With AIDS *[Moscow Radio]* 56
Well-Known Orthodox Priest Found Axed To Death *[AFP]* 56

Economic

TASS Reports on Gorbachev's Market Meeting 56
Meeting Scheduled for 7 Sep 56
Silayev Has 'Mixed Feelings' 56
Ryzhkov Discusses Government Economic Program *[Moscow TV]* 57
Construction Fair Opens; Market Switch Backed *[Moscow TV]* 61
Metallurgy Ministry Opens Consumer Goods Center *[Moscow TV]* 61
U.S.-Turkish-Soviet Construction Venture Formed *[Moscow TV]* 62
Shutdown of Chemical Plant Hampers Oil Drilling *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 6 Sep]* 62
Gorbachev Recognizes Construction Workers *[Moscow Radio]* 62
Registration of Republic Enterprises Examined *[Moscow Radio]* 62
Entrepreneurial Assistance Association Opens *[Moscow Radio]* 62

Agricultural

Late August Weather, Crop Situation Reported *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 6 Sep]* 63
Harvest Progress, Procurements Worse Than 1989 *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 8 Sep]* 63
Voronin Examines Harvesting Output, Problems *[Moscow TV]* 65
Army Resources Allocated to Harvest Stand Idle *[IZVESTIYA 18 Aug]* 65

Scientific

Cosmonauts Conduct Further Experiments on 'Mir' *[TASS]* 66
'Resurs-F' Earth Satellite Launched 7 Sep *[PRAVDA 9 Sep]* 66

Military

Shlyaga Interviewed on Politics in the Military *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 7 Sep]* 67
'Design Defects,' Crew Error Aided Sub Incident *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 6 Sep]* 68
Letter From Defense Industry Deplores Disarray *[PRAVDA 6 Sep]* 68

Celebrations Held in Honor of Tank Troops 70
Moiseyev Attends Ceremony *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 9 Sep]* 70
Yazov Issues Order *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 9 Sep]* 70

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Landsbergis Reviews Problems With Moscow Talks *[IZVESTIYA 6 Sep]* 72
Lithuanian Party Leader on CSCE Participation *[Helsinki Radio]* 72
Lithuanian Group Comments on German Unity *[Vilnius International]* 73
Vilnius Garrison Officers Issue Appeal *[Vilnius Radio]* 73
Lithuania Criticizes U.S. Media Coverage *[Vilnius International]* 73
Lithuanian Council Delegation Leaves for Poland *[Vilnius Radio]* 74
Civil Defense Exercise for Lithuania Planned *[Vilnius Radio]* 74
Lithuania Denies Part in Republic Economic Pact *[Vilnius International]* 74
Possibility of KGB in Lithuania Discussed *[Vilnius International]* 74
Plans of Latvian Political Parties Outlined *[Vilnius International]* 75
Latvian-RSFSR Draft Treaty Prepared *[TASS]* 75
Pact's Ratification 'Unlikely' *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 8 Sep]* 75
Secrecy Broken *[IZVESTIYA 4 Sep]* 76
Latvian Draft Law on Citizenship Demanded *[PRAVDA 9 Sep]* 76
Latvia's Current Political Situation Assessed *[TRUD 28 Aug]* 77
Estonian-USSR Talks in Moscow 'Broken Off' *[Vilnius International]* 79
Estonia Plans Establishment of Armed Forces *[Moscow Radio]* 79
Estonian Official Views Defense Organization *[Tallinn Radio]* 79
Premier Apologizes for Leningrad 'Provocation' *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 8 Sep]* 80
Envoys Visit Embassies on German Unification *[Moscow Television]* 80
Baltic States' Protection Bodies Meet in Vilnius *[Vilnius Radio]* 80
Baltic Military Appeals for Deserters' Return *[Vilnius Radio]* 81

RSFSR

Coverage of RSFSR Supreme Soviet Session 81
Ministerial Candidates Discussed *[PRAVDA 6 Sep]* 81
Barannikov on Power Transfers *[Moscow Radio]* 81
Ministerial Candidates Listed *[Moscow TV]* 82
Regional Party Holds Central Committee Plenum 82
Polozkov Discusses Plenum *[Moscow TV]* 82
Party Plenum Elects Officials *[TASS]* 83
Politburo, Secretariat Elected *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 8 Sep]* 83
Paper Reports on Plenum *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 8 Sep]* 83
Yeltsin Talks With Russian Trade Union Chief *[Moscow Radio]* 84
Poll Shows Yeltsin Has Highest Approval Rating *[Moscow International]* 84
Democratic Platform Official Addresses Congress *[Moscow Television]* 84
RSFSR's Silayev Receives Cuban Ambassador *[Moscow Radio]* 85
RSFSR Central Control Commission Meets *[Moscow Radio]* 86
Moscow Mayor Criticizes Failure of Perestroyka *[TASS]* 86
Currency Earnings Will Help Tourist Facilities *[Moscow TV]* 86
Russian, Moldavian Groups Meet To Discuss Pact *[TASS]* 87
RSFSR, Georgia Sign Cooperation Agreement *[Moscow Radio]* 87
State Foreign Exchange 'Monopoly' To End *[IZVESTIYA 6 Sep]* 87
RSFSR Food, Agriculture Minister Interviewed *[PRAVDA 30 Aug]* 87
Reasons for Moscow Bread Shortage Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 4 Sep]* 90
Leningrad Reported on Verge of 'Food Crisis' *[PRAVDA 30 Aug]* 91
Leningrad Obkom Assesses 28th Party Congress *[TASS]* 91
PRAVDA Reports on Leningrad Obkom Plenum *[31 Aug]* 92
Former Chief Executive To Head Kray Soviet *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 29 Aug]* 92
Plenum Accepts Sochi Party Chief's Resignation *[PRAVDA 30 Aug]* 92
Karelia To Try Trading Paper for Consumer Goods *[PRAVDA 30 Aug]* 92
Anti-Nuclear Demonstration Staged in Ufa *[Moscow International]* 93

New Oblast CPSU Committee Leader Elected *[Moscow Radio]* 93
Delays Affect GRES Construction in Transbaykal *[Moscow TV]* 93
Gasoline Supplies Run Out in Novokuznetsk *[Moscow Radio]* 93

Western Republics

Moldavian President Reports on Gorbachev Talks *[TASS]* 94
Snegur Appeals to Self-Proclaimed Republics *[TASS]* 94
Dnestr Breakaway Threatens Moldavia's Unity *[IZVESTIYA 4 Sep]* 94
Moldavian Supreme Soviet Resumes Session 8 Sep *[Moscow Radio]* 96
Internal Affairs Minister on Carabinieri Corps *[PRAVDA 7 Sep]* 96
Joint Ukrainian-Russian Statement Issued *[Kiev International]* 96

Caucasus

Armenia's New Interior Minister Profiled *[ARMENPRES]* 97
Party Organization Dissolved at Armenian Procuracy *[Yerevan Radio]* 98
Armenian Supreme Soviet To Publish Own Paper *[Yerevan Radio]* 98
Tension Continues on Armenia-Azerbaijan Border 98
Getashen 'Relatively Stable' *[Yerevan International]* 98
Communications Cut in NKAO *[Yerevan Radio]* 98
Militia's Call to Arms Assailed *[Yerevan Radio]* 99
Ministry Issues Statement *[Yerevan Radio]* 99
Catholicos Speaks on Conflict *[Yerevan International]* 100
Armenian Shepherds Killed *[TASS]* 100
General Says Arms Not Being Smuggled From Iran *[BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY 21 Aug]* 100
New Parties Registered for Georgia Elections *[TASS]* 101
Tbilisi Rally Fails To Consolidate Parties *[ZARYA VOSTOKA 12 Aug]* 101
Electoral Bloc Leader Cites Independence Aim *[IZVESTIYA 6 Sep]* 102
Gumbaridze, Gamsakhurdia Interviewed on Strike *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 35]* 102

Central Asia

Nazarbayev Speaks at Kazakh Presidential Council *[Moscow TV]* 104
Supreme Soviet Commission Discusses Osh Report *[Moscow TV]* 104
Kryuchkov Explains KGB's Role in Osh Unrest *[PRAVDA VOSTOKA 11 Aug]* 105
Kryuchkov's KGB Criticized *[SOYUZ No 34]* 105
Yeltsin Documentry Film Banned in Kirghizia *[Moscow Radio]* 106

Correction to Arms Control Reporting

WA1009140490

The following correction pertains to the item headlined "Flawed Arms Control Reporting Criticized," from Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian on 15 August, as published in the 22 August Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, pages 2-3:

Page 2, column one, paragraph eight, sentence one make read: ...the treaty on START. Articles of this.... (changing "SOA [strategic offensive arms]" to "START" and change throughout article)

Same page, column two, last complete paragraph, only sentence make read: ...of missiles removed from service, the utilization of heavy bombers as "flying laboratories" for environmental monitoring, the utilization of nuclear submarines as launch platforms for meteorological rockets in the ocean, and the utilization of ICBM silos to store waste products from nuclear power stations or from "poison gas elimination facilities." This is true daydreaming. The only things lacking are suggestions to build bridges and retail shops full of all sorts of colonial products.

At the START talks, both the Soviet and American sides have already agreed that it would be expedient to use some portion of the missiles to be eliminated to launch useful payloads into the upper atmosphere or into outer space. Furthermore, when possible former military missiles are already being used for such purposes. But unfortunately, this approach cannot be the basic one.

First of all, liquid-fueled military missiles use highly toxic fuel components. For peaceful launches, there should be a transition to rockets that use types of fuel that cannot pollute the environment (kerosene, hydrogen, or oxygen). And secondly, adapting military missiles to launch payloads into space would require design work that would cost at least several tens of millions of rubles and significant reconstruction work (adding an additional rocket stage, altering the control system and launcher, and so forth).

Taking this into account, and proceeding from the limited demand for light-weight satellites, on the order of 10 to 20 per year—and rebuilt missiles could carry only such satellites into orbit—it will often be better to use rockets which have been specifically designed for this and which are now being produced on a series basis.

Further, it is.... (supplying dropped material)

Genscher, Shevardnadze Confident of Signing Accord

LD0809103190 East Berlin Deutschlandsender Network in German 1000 GMT 8 Sep 90

[Text] Federal Foreign Minister Genscher and his Soviet counterpart Shevardnadze are confident that the concluding document of the two-plus-four foreign minister talks can be signed in Moscow on Wednesday. A spokesman from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs said in reply to an inquiry today that Genscher and Shevardnadze spoke to each other on the telephone last night.

The previous round of expert two-plus-four talks finished in East Berlin without a completed final document. It emerges from delegation circles that there are still some points left open which will have to be worked on in Moscow. These refer to the possibilities of the movement of allied troops, and the problem of missiles with dual nuclear and conventional application.

Genscher on USSR Demands, Price of Unification

LD0809140690 Hamburg DPA in German 1316 GMT 8 Sep 90

[Excerpts] Bonn/Berlin (DPA)—Federal Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher has described the Soviet Union's large demands for the financing of the stationing and withdrawal of USSR troops from Germany as the most important problem confronting the signing of the two-plus-four talks final document. The treaty on the external aspects of German unity is to be signed on Wednesday in Moscow by the foreign ministers of the United States, the USSR, Great Britain, France, and the two German states.

Genscher announced publicly for the first time in an interview with Deutschlandfunk that Moscow is demanding an amount running into the tens of billions [currency not specified]. "In actual fact, in this case it is a matter of the price of German unification," the foreign minister said.

Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl will again telephone Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev on Monday. [passage omitted]

Two other open issues which the negotiators at the preparatory talks in Berlin yesterday evening were not able to solve have apparently been settled in the meantime. Genscher said he held a long telephone conversation with his Soviet opposite number, Eduard Shevardnadze, on Friday evening, at which there had been "signs of solutions". This is first of all a matter of assurance that German forces will not be allowed to station any weapons systems on the territory of the former GDR which can also fire or carry nuclear ammunition. Second, an assurance should also be given that no allied NATO troops will take part in maneuvers on GDR territory.

In the interview, which was circulated by the Foreign Ministry in Bonn, Genscher for the first time spoke extensively on the sovereignty of a united Germany. It is clear that there can be no talk of full sovereignty until the conclusion of the final ratification procedures by the individual parliaments. This would be the case "in a few weeks, in any case within a few months". This, the foreign minister said, is no longer a key issue, however. It is also questionable whether the Soviets could decide on an interim solution by suspending rights reserved for the allies. However, it is important to all sides that a united Germany is not burdened by open issues. The signing in Moscow would now see to this.

Shevardnadze Interviewed on Asia-Pacific Region

PM0909182190 Moscow TRUD in Russian 9 Sep 90 p 3

[Interview with E.A. Shevardnadze by I. Belov under the "Topical Interview" rubric: "Confidence Is the Guarantee of Progress. USSR Foreign Minister Answers TRUD's Questions"—place and date not given; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] E.A. Shevardnadze's tour of a number of Asia-Pacific region countries was a notable international event in the past week. It is all the more topical because Soviet foreign policy is sometimes accused of being excessively "involved" with the U.S. and European areas to the detriment of active involvement in Asia and certain other parts of the world. Are such accusations justified? In conversation with TRUD's correspondent the leader of our country's foreign policy department answered a number of questions.

[Belov] I realize that since your return to Moscow, Eduard Amvrosiyevich, you have already "switched over" to other highly important forthcoming meetings—the talks between M.S. Gorbachev and G. Bush in Helsinki, the foreign ministers' session in Moscow within the framework of the "two-plus-four" mechanism, the visit to the USSR by U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker, and others. On 8 September our newspaper published an item from our Tokyo correspondent in which you discussed a number of aspects of Soviet-Japanese relations. Nonetheless, I would ask you once again to cast your mind back to the Far East and summarize the results of your talks in China, the DPRK, and Japan.

[Shevardnadze] With pleasure. There is plenty to talk about, as they say. Although a detailed analysis of the results will take some time.

The visit to Harbin and the talks with Chinese Foreign Minister Qian Qichen were of very great importance for both sides in the current rapidly changing international situation. It was important for us to confirm the idea that the Soviet Union and China are in agreement on a broad spectrum of "hot" issues—such as the Gulf crisis, the continuation of the Cambodian settlement process, and the securing of detente on the Korean peninsula.

My Chinese colleague and I advocated vigorous efforts to maintain the dynamics of Soviet-Chinese relations and to strengthen the spirit of trust and cooperation

between them. In this context I would like to highlight the agreement to start talks 10 September in Moscow on armed forces reduction in the Soviet-Chinese border region—the first such talks for Asia.

Finally, I cannot fail to mention that my stay in Harbin allowed us to get an impression of the improvement in the socioeconomic situation in China—which could not fail to please us. They are expecting a big harvest, and the changes and renewal are obvious. We felt the neighboring people's warm and friendly attitude toward Soviet people and our country.

In Pyongyang Foreign Minister Kim Yong-nam and I had a useful exchange of opinions on the situation in Northeast Asia and on the Korean peninsula. The USSR and the DPRK are sovereign states and, of course, determine their own foreign policy course independently. And yet, as neighboring countries that have maintained close and diverse ties for many years, we simply need to consult from time to time and to compare our approaches. On the eve of the commencement of the top-level dialogue between the DPRK and the Republic of Korea [as published] we expressed the hope that it would be successful, on the basis that both sides' proposals contain rational aspects whose careful nurturing would make it possible with time to resolve the unification problem, which is vital to both sides. We are striving to promote this in every possible way.

As for my talks in Tokyo—bearing in mind the previous article in your newspaper, I will mention just the main points. The talks ended with the weightiest results in all the past few years. A specific program was elaborated to prepare for the visit to Japan by USSR President M.S. Gorbachev—a visit which will create a good basis for ensuring that the forthcoming Soviet-Japanese summit is a major turning point in relations between the USSR and Japan—and substantive impetus was given to the efforts to transfer our relations to a qualitatively new level. The Japanese side responded positively to our proposal to devote the decade remaining until the 21st century to the building of new relations between our countries.

[Belov] At the Tokyo news conference you made what foreign journalists saw as a sensational statement about your willingness to meet with Prince N. Sihanouk. How did that decision come about?

[Shevardnadze] We have repeatedly suggested to the U.S. side, including during the talks with J. Baker in Irkutsk, that "crossover" meetings be held between U.S. representatives and Hun Sen, and between our representatives and N. Sihanouk. The U.S. secretary of state announced the U.S. decision the other day to initiate direct contacts with the Cambodian Government. We assess highly and welcome this U.S. step. For my part, while in Tokyo I also stated our readiness to enter into contact with Prince N. Sihanouk.

As you know, the Cambodian settlement process has now entered a decisive stage. Its successful conclusion will depend above all on the Khmer sides themselves. Under these conditions U.S. talks with the Cambodian Government and our talks with Prince N. Sihanouk will undoubtedly play a positive role and promote the cause of national reconciliation in Cambodia and the speediest resolution of the Cambodia problem.

[Belov] As has been reported, en route from Pyongyang to Tokyo you made a long speech in Vladivostok on the problems of the Asia-Pacific region. Could you summarize its main ideas and proposals for our readers?

[Shevardnadze] As you know, M.S. Gorbachev's speech in Vladivostok four years ago was a turning point for Soviet policy in this part of the world. This seemed to us to be a suitable moment to flesh out certain approaches and avenues as regards dialogue and cooperation in the Asia-Pacific region. We proposed, in particular:

Convening in Vladivostok in the fall of 1993 a meeting of foreign ministers from Asian states willing to accept this suggestion;

Holding consultations among the foreign ministers of the Asian and Pacific countries in New York at the end of September as part of the forthcoming scheduled UN General Assembly session;

Starting a dialogue on military problems and on confidence-building measures with all the states of the Asia-Pacific region;

Considering and implementing the idea of an international center to ensure the safety of sea lanes;

Moving toward the formation of a regional mechanism for cooperation to protect the environment, and working out proposals on the conclusion of a multilateral convention on the safeguarding of the Pacific's maritime and biological resources, as well as a convention on the protection of the Pacific region's environment;

And discussing the question of the creation of an international tropical cyclone early warning and notification center.

As you can see, this is a large program designed for the long-term and moving from the simple to the more complex. I would like to draw attention to the fact that we are striving to be as flexible as possible and are stressing in every possible way the voluntary nature of participation in the measures we are proposing.

[Belov] Eduard Amvrosiyevich, one of the themes of your Vladivostok speech was the unity of Europe and Asia and the formation of a single Eurasian space. Things in our country, unfortunately, are going in a different direction. Attention has focused on your statement that it is extremely dangerous to destroy your own home in the illusory hope that it will be possible to build something solid and viable on its ruins.

[Shevardnadze] I would not have touched upon a "domestic" subject at the Vladivostok international forum if it had not had obvious global importance. It is

no secret that the events and trends of the past two years are putting the fate of perestroyka at stake, and the Union's future along with it. Yet it is a question of the fate of processes which have opened up formerly inconceivable opportunities for the world to build a new world order. The delaying or, even worse, the ending of these processes would inevitably lead to the emergence of trends pernicious for international stability.

There is another aspect too. We have encountered a situation that is wholly out of the ordinary—many, many countries want to help us, and not just peoples but governments too. I pondered for a particularly long time over the last phrases of my Vladivostok speech: "Europe and Asia, East and West are moving toward each other. And they must meet if we do not want an agglomeration of ruins to emerge in the space which divides them. And now it is no longer just us that wants to prevent destruction—East and West, Europe and Asia, the entire human world want to help us in this."

[Belov] One last question. What were your impressions of your stay in Vladivostok?

[Shevardnadze] Vladivostok is a beautiful city, but it has many problems, of course. These were discussed during my meeting with the leaders of Maritime Kray—as they were heatedly and acutely discussed by the residents of Vladivostok with whom I talked in the city's streets. I would now like to highlight just what prompted the strongest emotions—it is necessary, without delay, to put an end to Vladivostok's "closed" status. This would allow us to fully realize its truly unique potential. I promised to examine this matter on my return to Moscow, and I firmly intend to keep my word.

Comparison of Shevardnadze's Vladivostok Speech

OW0609132890

Vladivostok Domestic Service in Russian at 2309 GMT on 3 September carries a 60-minute speech by Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze, Soviet foreign minister and member of the Presidential Council, which was delivered at the second international conference "The Asian-Pacific Region: Dialogue, Peace, and Cooperation." This version has been compared with the TASS English version published in the 5 September Soviet Union DAILY REPORT under the headline "Shevardnadze Gives Address," pages 3-10, revealing the following variations:

Page 3, column one, paragraph one, sentence one of Vladivostok Domestic version begins: [Text] Mr. Chairman,

Ladies.... (deleting TASS introduction)

Same column, last full paragraph, sentence one of Vladivostok Domestic version reads: ...philosophy of humanism.

The idea of.... (deleting sentence, picking up next paragraph)

Column two, first partial paragraph, sentence one of Vladivostok Domestic version reads: ...and non-violent world.

It is time for the Asian idea to begin working at full force, as the European idea is working today.

It is not.... (rewording)

Same column, second full paragraph, sentence two of Vladivostok Domestic version reads: ...the walls of self-imposed isolation.... (deleting "division")

Page 4, column one, paragraph four, sentence two of Vladivostok Domestic version reads: ...Whether it gets off to a good start and the fate of future generations will depend, in large measure, on.... (rewording, adding phrase)

Same page, column two, paragraph three, only sentence of Vladivostok Domestic version reads: ...of people's well-being and freedom.

The ethical self-determination.... (adding "and freedom")

Same column, paragraph seven, only sentence of Vladivostok Domestic version reads: ...for this would lead to the inevitable erosion of world law and order, and.... (rewording, changing "national" to "world")

Same column, paragraph 10, only sentence of Vladivostok Domestic version reads: ...policy of new political thinking.

All of.... (adding "political")

Same column, last paragraph, sentence one of Vladivostok Domestic version reads: ...eliminate its consequences with such energy. But it is essential to pursue our objective through nonmilitary means and in a way that would remove the military presence of other countries in the region.

Currently, many countries.... (adding phrases "with such energy" and "in the region")

Page 5, column one, paragraph four, sentence two of Vladivostok Domestic version reads: ...arsenals and the intolerably high level of.... (changing "critically" to "intolerably")

Same column, paragraph five, sentence one of Vladivostok Domestic version reads: ...to that situation, and there are more of our weapons there than necessary. I must say this directly. But that is.... (supplying additional material)

Same column, paragraph eight, sentence two of Vladivostok Domestic version reads: ...these lines and would take a fresh.... (changing "might" to "would")

Same column, penultimate paragraph, sentence two of Vladivostok Domestic version reads: Graf eight, from end of second sentence, reads: ...be given to nonmilitary means. Soviet-Chinese talks held a few days ago in Harbin and the discussions we had yesterday in Pyongyang have offered convincing proof that such an approach in shared by an absolute majority of states.

But the.... (deleting words, deleting editorial notation, changing "many" to "an absolute majority of")

Same page, column two, paragraph one, sentence one of Vladivostok Domestic version reads: ...a highly critical, dangerous situation, which has.... (changing "emergency" to "dangerous")

Same column, paragraph eight, third sentence of of Vladivostok Domestic version reads: ...toll of some 1.5 million human lives. In tribute to their memory, we must pull out all stops in our efforts to promote an intra-Afghan settlement. In general, matters are moving this way. As you know, together with the United States, we are the guarantors of the fulfillment of the Geneva accords.

Our latest contacts.... (supplying additional sentences)

Same column, last paragraph, sentence two of Vladivostok Domestic version reads: ...on 10 September of this year—namely, talks on a gradual reduction of armed forces and arms along the Soviet-Chinese border, which, as you know, is 7,500 km long.

We reaffirm our.... (supplying additional material, deleting two paragraphs)

Page 6, column one, paragraph four, sentence one of Vladivostok Domestic version reads: ...back to Vladivostok open-city status. In reality, Vladivostok is becoming open. I have no idea what secrets remain. So many of our own people and foreigners are living and meeting here. Tens of thousands of people, I have been told, visit here. This process probably should be accelerated. I think this corresponds with sentiments. [applause] But they say that the situation regarding foodstuffs has worsened, what with the appearance of so many people. But this is a temporary manifestation. The time will come when we will live like human beings; I have no doubts about this. You agree, do you not?

Asia and the.... (supplying additional material)

Same column, paragraph five, sentence two of Vladivostok Domestic version reads: ...Thailand and other ASEAN members. Other milestone events include the reestablishment of relations between China and Indonesia and Saudi Arabia, and the establishment of relations between the United States and Mongolia. I am sure that Indo-Pakistani relations will also be solved by peaceful means.

The countries of.... (substituting "ASEAN members" for "Asian countries," adding "Indonesia and," changing "would improve too" to "will also be solved by peaceful means," deleting quotation marks before first sentence of paragraph six)

Same column, paragraph six, sentence three of Vladivostok Domestic version reads: ...of Cambodia and, what is very important, the United States has announced plans to reduce somewhat its military presence in Asia and the Pacific. In the future, I am confident that the United States will act more boldly and on a broader scale in this regard.

A package of.... (supplying additional material)

Same column, penultimate paragraph, sentence one of Vladivostok Domestic version reads: ...the Cambodian settlement. And on this isue, too, I would like to note the positive changes in the position of the United States and the undoubtedly positive position of the PRC.

I wish to.... (adding sentence)

Same page, column two, first complete paragraph, last sentence of Vladivostok Domestic version reads: ...and acted upon. Today, on 4 September, the premiers of the two Koreas are meeting. Let us wish them success.

The ill-famed walls.... (adding two sentences.)

Same column, fifth complete paragraph, only sentence of Vladivostok Domestic version reads: ...security and cooperation and stability.

We find it.... (adding "and stability")

Page 7, column one, paragraph four, first sentence of of Vladivostok Domestic version reads: ...seen unprecedented change. We no longer view each other as enemies. This was declared at the highest level by both the USSR president and the U.S. President. They have begun building relations of partnership and mutual cooperation. These are no longer words but large-, very large-scale actions, and they are promoting peace.

We should not expect smooth sailing in the future, for we may still run into some difficulty and contradictions. But it would be very wrong not to notice the changes that have occurred in this sphere and the opportunities and enormous prospects they present.

It is hard.... (rewording, adding material, deleting editorial notation, substituting "contradictions" for "changes")

Same column, paragraph six, sentence one of Vladivostok Domestic version reads: ...occurred some three or four years ago. Presumably.... (adding "or four")

Same column, last paragraph, first sentence of Vladivostok Domestic version reads: ...an Asian-Pacific forum. I also have in mind our meeting here today.

We also clearly.... (adding sentence, deleting sentence)

Same page, column two, seventh complete paragraph, only sentence of Vladivostok Domestic version reads: ...of ocean communications.

Today, I would like to make a specific proposal: To invite—with your approval, of course, the approval of all the people living in your city—to invite the foreign affairs ministers of all Asian states that choose to accept this invitation to meet in Vladivostok, say, in the autumn of 1993. [applause] Could that be too long a time? Maybe sooner? [some murmuring in the audience]

This could be.... (rewording, supplying additional material)

Same column, final paragraph, only sentence of Vladivostok Domestic version reads: ...movement toward partnership.

I think that.... (deleting "etc.")

Page eight, paragraph one, only sentence of Vladivostok Domestic version reads: ...more open city.

When I speak about an open city I feel there is a certain element of skepticism present. That is unnecessary. Everything that has been said will be realized, I assure you.

Of course, in.... (adding paragraph)

Same column, paragraph six, only sentence of Vladivostok Domestic version reads: ...Japan and Indonesia.

We continue to.... (deleting paragraph)

Same page, column two, paragraph one, sentence one of Vladivostok Domestic version reads: ...involving economic development. I think there will be special reports here on questions regarding the region's economic development.

Lately, we have.... (adding sentence)

Same column, paragraph three, sentence one of Vladivostok Domestic version reads: ...measure, the world's economic climate and where economic integration processes are gaining momentum. We need to.... (rewording, deleting editorial notation)

Same column, paragraph six, sentence one of Vladivostok Domestic version reads: ...climate for investment. I am aware of the fact that such programs are being developed.

Among the measures.... (adding sentence)

Same column, penultimate paragraph, only sentence of Vladivostok Domestic version reads: ...development for Sakhalin Oblast and some other regions.

In this connection, I.... (substituting "Oblast" for "Province," adding "and some other regions," deleting quotation marks before "In")

Page nine, column one, first complete paragraph, only sentence of Vladivostok Domestic version reads: ...to similar programs being carried out in the framework of the Intergovernmental Forum of Asian-Pacific Economic Cooperation. Indeed, the Soviet.... (rewording)

Same column, third complete paragraph, only sentence of Vladivostok Domestic version reads: ...technology and expertise, naturally, with the use of accumulated local experience.

The Soviet Union.... (supplying additional material)

Same column, penultimate paragraph, sentence one of Vladivostok Domestic version reads: ...of biological resources of the Pacific Ocean, or what would be even better, the drafting of a convention on environmental protection in the entire enormous region. In this day.... (rewording, supplying additional material)

Same page, column two, paragraph four, last sentence of Vladivostok Domestic version reads: ...at lesser cost and effort.

What we are.... (adding "and effort")

Same column, last paragraph, first sentence of Vladivostok Domestic version reads: ...of my country, of our country. The developments and.... (adding "of our country")

Same paragraph, sentence two of Vladivostok Domestic version reads: ...of perestroyka and, with it, the future of our Union and our country. I must say this directly. I would not mention this grave.... (rewording, adding sentence)

Same paragraph, last sentence of Vladivostok Domestic version reads: ...for international stability. There should be no illusions about this.

We face huge.... (adding sentence)

Page 10, column one, paragraph two, sentence two of Vladivostok Domestic version reads: ...confederation and a confederation of Europe's shared goals. (changing "confederate" to "confederation of")

Same column, paragraph four, only sentence of Vladivostok Domestic version reads: ...building on the ruins something more stable.... (changing "rains" to "ruins")

Column two, first partial paragraph, first complete sentence of Vladivostok Domestic version reads: ...cause of democracy, freedom, and the future of our people.

In upholding democracy.... (supplying additional material)

Same column, third complete paragraph, last sentence of Vladivostok Domestic version reads: ...world of humans, as well as all of progressive mankind, stand prepared to give us a hand.

Thank you, comrades, for your attention. [applause] (rewording, supplying additional material)

United States & Canada

Helsinki Summit Reports Focus on Gorbachev

Arrives in Helsinki 8 Sep

LD0809155990 Moscow TASS in English 1555 GMT 8 Sep 90

[By TASS special correspondents]

[Text] Helsinki September 8 TASS—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev arrived in the Finnish capital tonight. He will meet U.S. President George Bush here on Sunday.

Makes Brief Arrival Statement

LD0809173390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1630 GMT 8 Sep 90

[By special correspondent Andrey Ptashnikov in Helsinki]

[Text] The USSR president's Il-62 aircraft, with the words Sovetskiy Soyuz emblazoned on its side, landed at Helsinki airport 30 minutes ago. Comrade Gorbachev and his wife and the members of the Soviet delegation were met by Finish President Koivisto and his wife and other officials. In keeping with protocol a military band played the anthems of the two countries. Mikhail Sergeyevich made a short statement afterwards:

[Begin Gorbachev recording] Esteemed Mr. President Koivisto, Esteemed Mrs. Koivisto:

I would like to thank you, and through you the friendly people of Finland, for your hospitality, for this meeting, for the fact that you have once again agreed to be part of a very important event. Thank you.

It is very symbolic that this important meeting between the presidents of the United States and the Soviet Union should be taking place here in the Finnish capital of Helsinki, where many very important positive processes were destined to be born—thus it was ordained by history—processes which are continuing to be driven forward today and hold out great promises.

President George Bush expressed the wish to hold a meeting at this crucial moment in our history when there is a constant need to synchronize our political watches, when cooperation is essential to sustain the enormous positive processes which are underway in the world, and to prevent them from being knocked off course by one event or another.

I accepted this invitation with satisfaction and, with the urgency and speed which the Finnish leadership displayed, here we are. I hope that this is going to be an important meeting. We have things to discuss, though we constantly exchange views, keep in contact by telephone, letters and through our plenipotentiary representatives, but at a time like this there is a need for personal contact. I believe that we shall discuss both the acute crisis in the Persian Gulf and many other questions, topical questions of world politics.

I would like to conclude this brief address with words of cordial greeting to the Finnish people from all the peoples of the Soviet Union, and with a wish for the prosperity of your wonderful country. [end recording]

[Ptashnikov] With the official reception ceremony at the airport over, the motorcade left for the city where a conversation will take place at the presidential palace between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Finnish President Koivisto.

Thanks Residents for Welcome

LD0809194690

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1700 GMT on 8 September in the "Vremya" newscast carries a five-minute video recording of President Gorbachev's arrival in Helsinki. The report shows the Gorbachevs and others leaving the aircraft and shaking hands with the Koivistos and others, and then Gorbachev delivering his address at the airport, the Koivistos and Raisa standing alongside him. The correspondent says: "From the airport the convoy set off for the Soviet embassy, the residence of the president of the USSR. He was warmly welcomed by the inhabitants of Helsinki." The video shows Soviet guests climbing into cars, driving along crowd-lined streets, then Gorbachev and Raisa walking along the street with bodyguards, smiling and shaking hands with the crowd. To applause, Gorbachev says to the crowd: "I hope that this meeting will be very important and serious. Thank you for the welcome! Thank you!" They are shown moving off to applause from the crowd, surrounded by bodyguards and journalists.

Meets With Finnish President

LD0909061190 Moscow TASS in English 0603 GMT 9 Sep 90

[Text] Helsinki September 9 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev met Mauno Koivisto on Saturday evening after his arrival in Helsinki. At a friendly and sincere meeting lasting for several hours, the sides discussed in detail work on the results on last year's official visit to Finland.

This concerned, above all, economic relations and ecological problems of the Kola peninsula and northern Europe as a whole.

Gorbachev and Koivisto who is deeply interested in the progress of perestroyka in the USSR, discussed prospects for Soviet-Finnish relations in the context of forthcoming important decisions and changes in the Soviet Union.

They also dealt with theoretical aspects in this sphere.

The presidents stated identity of views on urgent issues of the European process and the Gulf crisis.

This was a meeting between two people who understand tasks facing them well, trust each other and are ready to use every opportunity to raise the role of Soviet-Finnish interaction for the good of their peoples, to assert and develop new international relations.

Bush Issues Statement Upon Arrival in Helsinki

PM0909174790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Sep 90 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "On Eve of Important Event"]

[Excerpts] Helsinki, 8 Sep—USSR President M.S. Gorbachev arrived here today. On Sunday 9 September he will meet with U.S. President G. Bush to discuss international and bilateral issues. [passage omitted]

A few hours earlier U.S. President G. Bush arrived in his Boeing.

In a statement to journalists he said that during the talks with President Gorbachev attention would focus on a wide range of problems. We are striving, the President noted, to continue the progress toward the creation of a new Europe, united and free. We are striving to promote the acceleration of the pace of arms control, strategic and conventional. I would also like to learn about the progress on implementing reform in the Soviet Union and to study other questions of interest to our two countries. And, undoubtedly, I hope that we will devote a large part of our meeting to a discussion of the situation in the Persian Gulf. This year I have repeatedly stated that we have entered a new era in international affairs. This meeting is taking place at a most important time, when the actions we are taking could shape a new world order for many years to come.

Previously many regional conflicts emerged against the backdrop of the wider "cold war" conflict and actions by mercenary regimes and rulers of unpredictable behavior who resorted to force in the belief that the deadlock in relations between the superpowers would hamper joint retaliatory measures. International law and international organizations were often paralyzed and powerless to prevent conflicts or to restore peace.

However, the international reaction to Iraq's invasion shows how strikingly everything has changed. Here in Helsinki I will be meeting with President Gorbachev in order, I hope, to strengthen our common approach to this unjustifiable aggression. Much is at stake, and there is much the world stands to gain if the nations of the world, acting together, continue, as they have been doing, to isolate Iraq and deny Saddam Husayn the fruits of aggression. We intend to set in place the cornerstone of an international order more peaceful, stable, and secure than what we have now.

This evening there was a meeting in the presidential palace between M. Koivisto and M.S. Gorbachev. Questions of Soviet-Finnish cooperation and international problems were discussed during a conversation.

Gorbachev, Bush Begin Consultations 9 Sep

Discuss Gulf Situation

PM0909195390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Sep 90 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Talks Held"]

[Text] Helsinki, 9 Sep—USSR President M.S. Gorbachev met with U.S. President George Bush in the Finnish capital today. During the talks the position in the Persian Gulf, other international problems, and questions of bilateral relations were examined. A joint statement was adopted at the end of the talks.

M.S. Gorbachev left for home this evening. He was accompanied by E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the Presidential Council and USSR foreign minister, and Ye.M. Primakov, member of the Presidential Council. They were seen off at Helsinki's Vantaa International Airport by M. Koivisto. M.S. Gorbachev returned to Moscow the same day.

Issue Joint Statement

PM0909194990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Sep 90 Second Edition p 1

[Text] With regard to Iraq's invasion and continued military occupation of Kuwait, President Bush and President Gorbachev issue the following joint statement:

We are united in the belief that Iraq's aggression must not be tolerated. No peaceful international order is possible if larger states can devour their smaller neighbors.

We reaffirm the joint statement of our foreign ministers of August 3, 1990 and our support for United Nations Security Council resolutions 660, 661, 662, 663, 664 and 665. Today, we once again call upon the Governmnt of Iraq to withdraw unconditionally from Kuwait, to allow the restoration of Kuwait's legitimate government, and to free all hostages now held in Iraq and Kuwait.

Nothing short of the complete implementation of the United Nations Security Council resolutions is acceptable.

Nothing short of a return to the pre-August 2 status of Kuwait can end Iraq's isolation.

We call upon the entire world community to adhere to the sanctions mandated by the United Nations, and we pledge to work, individually and in concert, to ensure full compliance with the sanctions. At the same time, the United States and the Soviet Union recognize that U.N. Security Council Resolution 661 permits, in humanitarian circumstances, the importation into Iraq and Kuwait of food. The Sanctions committee will make recomendations to the Security Council on what would constitute humanitarian circumstances. The United States and the Soviet Union further agree that any such imports must be strictly monitored by the appropriate

international agencies to ensure that food reaches only those for whom it is intended, with special priority being given to meeting the needs of children.

Our preference is to resolve the crisis peacefully, and we will be united against Iraq's aggression. However, we are determined to see this aggression end, and if the current steps fail to end it, we are prepared to consider additional ones consistent with the U.N. Charter. We must demonstrate beyond any doubt that aggression cannot and will not pay.

As soon as the objectives mandated by the U.N. Security Council resolution mentioned above have been achieved, the Presidents will direct their foreign ministers to work with countries in the region and outside it to develop regional security structures and measures to promote peace and stability. It is essential to work actively to resolve all remaining conflicts in the Middle East and Persian Gulf. Both sides will continue to consult each other and initiate measures to pursue these broader objectives at the proper time.

Hold News Conference

LD0909172890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1434 GMT 9 Sep 90

[Joint news conference by USSR President M.S. Gorbachev and U.S. President George Bush in the Finlandia Hall in Helsinki on 9 September—live]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] [Helen Thomas] And what can President Gorbachev say about this?

[Gorbachev] In reply to your question I would like to say that our entire seven-hour meeting today was devoted to seeking a political solution to that most acute conflict. And I think we are on the right path. [passage omitted]

I wish to add and to confirm that which has been stated by the U.S. President during our conversation: that the United States does not intend to leave its troops in that zone. And taking into account and in connection with changes and the normalization of the situation [in the Gulf], the U.S. Administration and the President personally will do their best to have troops withdrawn from there. That is a very important statement.

[Unidentified correspondent in English with superimposed Russian translation] A question for both presidents: The unity which you are expressing today and at the same time the continuation of certain differences between the two countries. President Bush, have you started to yield to a greater degree regarding Western economic aid to the Soviet Union? And President Gorbachev, what do you think, should the Soviet military advisers now be withdrawn from Iraq? [passage omitted]

[Gorbachev] I did not reply; there was a question to me. I would like, nevertheless, concerning the question which was not, as it were, addressed to me, on Western aid to the Soviet Union—to continue the conversation on this matter begun by President Bush, the more so as there is here, I can see, an attempt to link it with disagreements or the absence of such. This is what I have to say. The President and I began our conversation today from the point that in actual fact we are currently in a situation in which the whole world community and our two immense states are undergoing a test of robustness in our new approaches to resolving the problems of the world situation. And our entry into the new period of peace, our exit from the cold war, are showing that no less, or rather, immense efforts are required of us to find methods in this peaceful period which are commensurate with the new approaches, and the resolution of all problems. I think that if there had been no Malta, it would have been very difficult for us to act in the most complex situation which has been in progress in Eastern Europe, in Europe, and in the situation connected with the unification of Germany. I think that if there had not subsequently been Washington and Camp David, and the other meetings of such rank with other partners in international relations, we would have found ourselves in a difficult position as a result of the situation, the crisis situation in the Persian Gulf. And the fact that we are today united in our approaches in addressing such acute problems which can have tragic consequences for the whole of the world community, not only for this region, this shows that we are, after all, moving in the right direction, and are capable of addressing the most major, most acute problems, and of giving an adequate response to the challenges of the age. And so, a large part of my conversation with President Bush was devoted to this, and I think that this is the main thing that has to be seen: there can be disagreements, nuances, arguments, there can be differences, I think that this is all natural, but we have today placed on record the main achievements of the recent period.

A question was put to me just now on the specialists in Iraq. Yes, I didn't complete the first subject, I'm sorry. I would not like such a view to be formed from President Bush's reply that the Soviet Union will be awarded this or that sum for this or that behavoior. I think that everything, the fact that we are acting in an acute situation, finding a solution, the kind to satisfy, and the main thing, secure all of us from an explosion—in this situation cooperation becomes a normal element, new cooperation, in new forms, in trade, in the economy, and in technology, and in human exchanges—all of these are elements of the new period, peaceful period which we have only just entered and which we are still trying to master. It would be very superficial and over-simplified to judge that the Soviet Union can be bought for dollars, although I have to say that we are now counting on cooperation at this very serious stage of radical, profound changes, of the reforms of recent years in a number of states, they always presupposed, together with the main efforts of the peoples which were embarking upon the road of reform, the participation of the world community in one form or another. Let's see it this way. If anyone foists another view, then I think that this is unacceptable, either for the United States or for the Soviet Union, or for any state.

And second: the second part of the question, concerning our specialists in Iraq. We are talking, in fact, not about advisers but about specialists who are serving on contracts. The number of them is diminishing. While at the start of the conflict there were, I believe, 196 of them, there are now around 150, and indeed the Iraqi leadership's view of this question is that if they have completed their affairs—this is normal contract work, even though we are talking about weapons—then they leave Iraq, and that process is proceeding. So, as I see it, there is no problem here.

[Kondrashev] Kondrashev of IZVESTIYA. A question for both Presidents. Was there discussion of possible military options for curbing Iraqi aggression? At what point and in what conditions will you consider that political methods have been exhausted and that military measures are needed to ensure compliance with the Security Council's resolutions concerning withdrawal of Iraqi troops from Kuwait? [passage omitted]

[Gorbachev] I wish to confirm what President Bush has said. I affirm once again that the whole of our time was used—that part of our time which related to this conflict—for seeking a political peaceful solution. I believe that we can look with optimism in the final analysis to the efforts being undertaken by the world community, to joint actions by combining their efforts within the framework of the UN Security Council.

[Unidentified correspondent] Mikhail Sergeyevich, you have just been saying that if full use is not made of... that is, if Iraq does not withdraw its troos peacefully then you will resort to military methods. What form will Soviet participation in such a method take, and what about the remaining Soviet citizens in Iraq? And what role will the Arab factor play on the map for resolving the issue by the military method? Thank you.

[Gorbachev] Firstly, I did not say that we would change peaceful... to military methods if as a result of peaceful methods Iraq does not follow the will of the people and withdraw—I did not claim this and I am not claiming this now. Furthermore I believe that this would draw us into unpredictable consequences. Therefore I believe that both of our states and the nations united in the United Nations have an enormous arsenal of approaches to reach a political solution of this problem. For this reason, I can limit myself to this and hence the second part of your question is irrelevant.

[Unidentified correspondent in English with superimposed Russian translation] A question for President Gorbachev. Iraq was your ally. What specifically have you undertaken in the way of contacts with Saddam Husayn in order to change the situation? And a question to President Bush. What specifically did you ask President Gorbachev to undertake? Did you ask him to establish direct contact with Husayn?

[Gorbachev] I should say that since the beginning of the crisis we have been conducting an active dialogue and exchange of opinions not just within the context of the Security Council and not just with the administration of the United States of America, and we value these contacts and dialogue highly. We are maintaining an active dialogue with the leaders of China, India, all the European states, and first of all, the permanent members of the Security Council. And I believe that this, precisely, has helped us to reach the decisions that the Security Council has adopted. In exactly the same way I can say that we are actively conducting [as heard] and cooperating with the Arab world, with the Arab states, and a dialogue is being conducted no less intensively here too, including with President Husayn. I can say that—what we are saying publicly—that we are also conveying our ideas and our arguments to President Husayn, and that the meaning of all this comes down to the fact that the president and the whole Iraqi leadership should display good sense, should stop—more than that—should draw conclusions from the general position and demands which ensue from the decisions of the Security Council on this issue. We are conducting such a discussion. We are trying to get across our arguments to the [Iraqi] leadership. We are discussing possible outcomes of this situation with them, and, just as I have just told you, we are trying to get across to Saddam Husayn the thought that if Iraq provokes military actions, that would be a tragedy, above all, for the Iraqi people and for the whole region, but it would cost our whole world dearly. You know, for all the sharpness of this dialogue, we believe nevertheless that it is useful to continue it, and we are not excluding that new contacts are possible, meetings at various levels, and the nature of our links with that state during the preceding period allows us to hope that we can realize these links to the benefit of all of us in the search for a peaceful solution to this problem, and, unfailingly, with the resoration of the situation before the aggression that was undertaken against Kuwait. [passage omitted]

[Gorbachev] I want to confirm what President Bush said, that we did indeed agree to make further efforts and give instructions once again since we see that there is a possibility of completing the talks process successfully at these two forums, and of reaching a positive result by the end of this year.

[(?Saqrisarian) in English with superimposed Russian translation] My question is... Good evening, Dora (?Saqrisarian) from the Palestine News Agency WAFA... my question is addressed to President Bush, and I should also like to hear President Gorbachev's opinion. President Bush says that there is no connection between the Palestine question and the current situation. I want to understand how it is that it is so important to fulfil the UN resolution on this question when other resolutions have not been fulfilled for so long. I want to know why the current aggression is different from other aggressions. I want to say that I personally consider that the Palestinian question is a question demanding more attention from the superpowers than ever before. [passage omitted]

[Gorbachev] I think that everything happening in the Near East worries us equally, and we must.... I would go further and say that what is happening in the Persian Gulf is yet one more reminder that we must act more energetically so as to untie this Near East knot, and to arrive at solutions and at a system, at guarantees, that would ensure the interests of all peoples, and of the whole world community, insofar as this affects all of us very strongly. It seems to me that there is a connection here, for the general lack of settlement in the Near East does make itself felt, and it is manifesting itself here too, giving this conflict an extra edge.

[Unidentified correspondent in English, with superimposed Russian translation] In your statement you state your readiness to act independently and jointly to ensure full compliance with UN sanctions with respect to Iraq. What specific steps have you agreed to take to put this into effect? [passage omitted]

[Gorbachev] I should like to add to this that the accent is being placed upon the significance of the political affirmation which we considered necessary to reflect in this statement and which is evidence of our political will indeed to act either jointly or in parallel and independently in a search for new steps to a peaceful solution of this problem. I believe that for the meeting and the document that we are adopting on the results of the meeting, this is of greater significance than if we had enumerated or described one or two steps there. It is a matter of a political affirmation which establishes a basis for a search and for energetic action.

[Unidentified TASS correspondent] The soviet agency TASS. I too have a question for the two countries' presidents. Mr. President, Mikhail Sergeyevich: Following your recent meetings, as far as we are able to judge, good mutual understanding has been established between you. Have you been able to deepen this mutual understanding in the course of this meeting, and how does this factor generally affect the results of your talks? [passage omitted]

[Gorbachev] I don't know if I can reveal a secret, I didn't consult with the President. But this is very.... I have a wish to deal with it, even, perhaps, risking something [laughter]... but this is too important in replying to this question. And the final phrase enables me to hope that everything will work out OK. Mr President said in today's conversation, you know, for a long time we took as our premise that the Soviet Union actually has nothing to do in the Near East, and that its role here is very limited. At the meeting today—and this path had to be covered—it was said that cooperation is very important here, just as in other areas of world politics. There's a concrete reply to this question. This is very important, at every meeting something occurs, every meeting enriches, and I have to say the main thing, that a greater degree of trust is engendered. If a greater degree of trust is engendered, is formed, between the leaders of two such states, then I hope that you will agree with me that this is our common asset. Whether we like it or not, but history had ordained that a great deal depends on how we interact. This is not ambition, this is indeed history that has so ordained. And we do not preclude, on the contrary, we interact with others more and more, in any steps, we cooperate, we conduct a dialogue, and this is correct, and we are devoted to this, but nevertheless we see our role.

And now my last observation, it carries a very heavy load. It seems to me that our world is such, and is changing in such a way, that there is today not a single country, however powerful it might be which will manage to ensure that very leadership to which certain countries have laid claim, including, perhaps, their representatives are sitting here—today we have to cooperate, and address problems together. This is what is emerging, this is, perhaps, the most important thing that is occurring.

[Unidentified voice] (?Karen Hustler), please.

[Unidentified French correspondent] Mikhail Sergeyevich, please. A question from French television, Mikhail Sergeyevich, please. I shall ask you in French, if you don't mind. [in French with superimposed Russian translation] Is the Soviet Union still the friends of Iraq, as Tariq 'Aziz stated in Moscow last week? Are you still the friends of Saddam Husayn? And another question, also to Mr. Gorbachev. President Saddam Husayn stated yesterday that the Soviet Union would prove that it is a great power if it resists pressure from Bush, and if it supports the Baghdad regime. How will you reply to Saddam Husayn?

[Gorbachev] I shall reply, in order for me to reply to you and to President Saddam Husayn. I shall have to repeat what we said in the statement, and what I have said in my replies to previous questions. My position does not change. And we see our role, and we see our responsibility, cooperating with the members of the Security Council, and in the case in question I can say once again, as we are sitting next to one another, the two presidents, cooperating with the President of the United States. I would like very much to express the hope that President Saddam Husayn will show—I hope this—will show sobriety, that he will assess everything, and respond to the calls and demands of the world community, and that he will take such steps which might be accurately evaluated both in the world, and I hope, in the Arab world, too. This is important in order that Iraq... at least, no one intends to exclude Iraq from the world community, but what the current leadership of Iraq is doing, it is driving itself into a dead end. Let President Saddam Husayn hear these appeals to him.

[Unidentified correspondent] Sorry, Mr. President. As a neighboring country... I represent the Turkish press, but I have been unable, I have tried to grab a microphone. [woman's voice interrupts] Allow me to continue. Well, ladies first.

[Unidentified correspondent] I would like to ask you Mr. Gorbachev, whether you rule out the possibility of Soviet

military participation in any sense, either in a naval blockade or in a peacekeeping force in the region, or not? And let me go on to ask Mr. Bush whether the Soviet Union's stance on this will disappoint the American side or not?

[Gorbachev] I see no point in this at the moment and we will continue to act, cooperating within the framework of the Security Council and strictly guided by its decisions. [passage omitted]

[Unidentified correspondent] You say that you want the aggression to end and that steps of some kind are being taken, but what will happen next?

[Gorbachev] Let me say a couple of words. [Finnish television correspondent tries to ask a question; interpreter interrupts saying the question was addressed to both presidents]

[Gorbachev] Please forgive me, Mr. President. You know, it seems to me that the view that someone is lacking in determination, that we are retreating in the face of those who are treacherously flouting international law, is appearing both in the press and public opinion of certain countries. I cannot agree with this. The desire is to use this to place in a difficult position the leaders of states involved in this situation through the Security Council. It seems to me that what has been done so far in response to the Iraqi aggression is highly significant. United actions have been secured not only within the framework of the United Nations Security Council, but there is a great degree of unity in the world community. This solidarity is unprecedented.

At last, the development of this aggression has been prevented. At last, structures are in place, preserved and functioning, which do not upset world economic ties, and, after all, this affects numerous countries. And so, I have to say that, all in all, what has been achieved is... yes, and at last, a decision has been adopted on an embargo as a very tough measure in response to the aggression. I believe, these are strategic tasks that have been resolved at the first stage. This very important. And our optimism and confidence that at the next stage also we will succeed with political solutions, through political means, in untying this most acute, in halting this acute international crisis and shifting it into a different channel, one of political settlement—this is really determination, it is really strength of will, it is really responsibility, and I think that adherence by politicians to these methods of settling this most acute crisis demonstrates their responsibilty both to their own peoples and to the whole world community. And we are not going to be caught out by those who are already beginning to make a fuss and raise the topic of prestige.

[Petaeistoe in English with superimosed Russian translation] Helena Petaeistoe from Finnish television. On the question of humanitarian aid. Does your joint statement mean in practice that you consider it possible to permit food to be sent to Iraq?

[Gorbachev] The President and I considered it necessary to reflect in our statement the fact that we share the positions of the Security Council on this score. The Security Council position permits the provision of medicines and foods for humanitarian purposes to those in need, and first and foremost for children. And this is stated forthrightly in our statement. So we are clear-cut on this question. But we were also clear-cut on the question that this should be put into effect within the framework of action by certain international organizations and should be under their control at all stages. I believe that this too is the correct way of doing things. [passage omitted]

[(?Cochran) in English with superimposed Russian translation] John (?Cochran). Could you clear up a few points? It would seem that you are not in agreement with respect to military options. When you talk about further steps for implementing UN sanctions, President Bush says the military option remains, while President Gorbachev appears not to be in agreement. What is the reality? Did you ask President Gorbachev to withdraw the advisers and send Soviet troops to the region? [passage omitted]

[Gorbachev] To all the questions which you have put down as a list, I have given answers and I have nothing to add to my answers.

[Unidentified correspondent] One final question. Please go ahead.

[Unidentified correspondent] Cairo, Egypt's AL-AHRAM. A question for the two presidents. You have spoken about measures in the field of security. Does the Soviet Union intend to participate in any measures to ensure security and what will the role be of the countries of this reigon of the Middle East?

[Gorbachev] To the first question, I think that we will cooperate, as we have begun, cooperate, closely cooperate, actively cooperate within the framework of the Security Council. And we will act correspondingly, on the basis of adopted decisions. That is the first thing. Secondly, on the role of the countries of this region. Yes, I think that, all in all, I will even stress it thus, that the Arab factor has so far not been really brought into play in settling this crisis situation. I do not want at the moment to offer you my analysis of why this is the case but, nevertheless, I am certain that a growing dynamism is, all the same, evident in the stances and searches of the Arab states for a way out of the serious situation in which we have all found ourselves. We are cooperating with all the Arab countries and I have to say that fairly useful outlines of possible steps are taking place but it it still too early to speak about them. We will continue to cooperate with the Arab countries. And, moreover, at some stage, when the situation changes and eases, they could replace both the American troops and, under the flag of the United Nations, undertake responsibility. But, in our turn, we permanent members of the Security Council, our countries included, could be guarantors of security.

But this will already be at the next stage of the process, provided we succeed in concluding it and here. I am convinced that we will conclude it by a political settlement of this crisis. [passage omitted]

[Gorbachev] I would like the President and myself to conclude our news conference by expressing our deep feelings and sympathy to the people of Finland for the hospitality extended to us on this soil and to appreciate highly the contribution made by the President of Finland and his spouse in creating good conditions for holding this meeting.

Gorbachev, Aides Depart 9 Sep

LD0909180990 Moscow TASS in English 1756 GMT 9 Sep 90

[Text] Helsinki September 9 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev left the Finnish capital for home today at the end of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting.

At Helsinki-Vantaa Airport he was seen of by Finnish President Mauno Koivisto.

Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and member of the Presidential Council Yevgeniy Primakov also left.

Bush Satisfied With Talks

LD1009081290 Moscow TASS in English 0755 GMT 10 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondents Aleksey Berezhov and Oleg Polyakovskiy]

[Text] Washington September 10 TASS—Flying home after his meeting with President Mikhail Gorbachev, U.S. President Bush expressed satisfaction with the results of the summit.

Its essence was a call for observing U.N. sanctions, noted Bush, stressing that the Soviet-American stand on this question gives a clear signal to Saddam Husayn. Bush said that this would also be a signal to the entire world.

Bush praised the joint statement issued on the results of the meeting. He stressed that the next step would be to ensure the implementation of U.N. sanctions.

Asked whether he had any differences with President Gorbachev, Bush said that nobody said that the United States and the Soviet Union had reached agreement on every point. However, everything is clear concerning the demand that Iraq should withdraw from Kuwait.

Bush mentioned the possibility of another meeting with Gorbachev later this year or early next year.

Gorbachev's Evaluations of Summit Reported

'Optimistic' About Talks

LD0909121190 Moscow TASS in English 1204 GMT 9 Sep 90

[Text] Helsinki September 9 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev was very optimistic after his first round of one-to-one talks with George Bush, which lasted two hours and 50 minutes this morning, the Soviet president's spokesman told reporters covering the summit.

Vitaliy Ignatenko said at a briefing during a break in the talks that they are being held in a very constructive spirit, which, he said, was typical of the two men's previous get-together at Camp David in the United States.

White House Press Secretary Marlin Fitzwater said, for his part, that the presidents held a good meeting, which, he said, "focused almost entirely on the Persian Gulf situation, and we are united."

He said the two countries take the Gulf crisis very seriously. He added that the presidents discussed related U.N. resolutions and are determined to press for the complete enforcement of sanctions envisaged in the documents.

Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze met U.S. Secretary James Baker today, the briefing was told.

Labels Meeting 'Substantive'

LD0909130790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 9 Sep 90

[Text] The main event today is undoubtedly the meeting in Helsinki between USSR President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and U.S. President George Bush.

At this moment their talks are continuing. I have asked our special correspondent in Helsinki, Andrey Ptashnikov, how they are going. Good day, Andrey.

[Ptashnikov] Good day, Aleksandr. The talks began today at 1100 Moscow time, but we journalists received a report not long ago that they are progressing, and as the saying goes, from the horse's mouth. The point is that imediately after the conclusion of the first round of the discussions, which took place in the presidential palace, Comrade Gorbachev and George Bush quite unexpectedly appeared before the correspondents who had been alowed into the palace.

Naturally ther was immediately a hail of questions. The main one of these was literally this: Are you satisfied with the talks? Mikhail Sergeyevich replied to it. I give his reply word for word: It was a good discussion, a substantive one. As you can see, just three words but they say a lot. [passage omitted]

Let me remind you that, according to plan, today's news conference is to begin at 1830 [1430 GMT] Moscow time. As far as I know Central Television will broadcast it live. and probably radio, too. Let me repeat once again, that this news conference should begin at 1830, again provided that the talks end on time. But if they are delayed, if they go on longer, then, naturally, the news conference will be postponed a little, too.

But now the Soviet-U.S. summit talks are continuing. As has become known, the second round is proceeding with a larger number of participants. But it is difficult for me to say precisely what is being discussed. But if one goes by the preliminary agenda, then the sides, apart from the situation in the Persian Gulf, are also to discuss the position in other regions of the planet, various aspects of Soviet-U.S. relations, questions of disarmament, and further steps for the construction of a new peaceful Europe.

As you can see all the questions are very important and very serious, but how they are to be resolved and if they are, we will find out at the joint news conference. There is not long to wait now.

Interviewed on Results

LD0909203290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 9 Sep 90

[Interview with USSR President M.S. Gorbachev by Soviet television and radio in Soviet Embassy, Helsinki—recorded]

[Text] [Unidentified correspondent] Mikhail Sergeyevich, the visit is now over, we are on the territory of the Soviet Union, at the Soviet Embassy. On the eve of the meeting, observers were calling this meeting definitive for relations between our countries, the United States and the USSR, and were even saying that it would be the starting point for a new era. Have these forecasts proved justified, and what has emerged that is new in relations between the USSR and United States following this meeting?

[Gorbachev] Well, that is a question which calls for quite broad discussion, of course, but all the same I will try to reply briefly to this very important, and perhaps definitive, question. Indeed, this meeting has on the one hand been a continuation of Malta, Washington, Camp David, and many other contacts, exchanges of views and messages; it has been organically linked with these. It would not have happened if we had not had this whole stage that we have already traversed, in cooperating with this administration of the United States and personally with President Bush. But the uniqueness and particular significance of this meeting can nevertheless be noted, and you are right to speak about this, and I am prepared to agree with many statements, both in the press and in public circles, concerning the place and role which this meeting has occupied and I hope, will occupy. Indeed, we have embarked on this new and peaceful period of development. The cold war has been left behind, as it were. And at the same time, it is still only the beginning.

At the same time, this has coincided with such profound changes, in Europe, in the world, and we, as it were, are now all undergoing the test, the trial of time. And if you add to this that such a crisis has flared up in the Persian Gulf, then this is very... [changes thought] we have all found ourselves in a difficult situation. And it occurs to me that nevertheless, one can say that both what happened before this meeting, in the framework of cooperation between the two countries and their leaders, and what has happened in the framework of the Security Council, all this confirms that there is the chance of political solutions, of responsible decisions, when there is goodwill, when there is a degree of some kind of trust, of cooperation—after all, these are things that were generally lacking for decades, and it was difficult. Remember the crisis of 1967, it was analogous, and what it developed into, and to this day we have been unable to resolve what we inherited. Remember how we behaved then, in the spirit of harsh confrontation. On the verge, the world was on the verge of war. I think that now this meeting has shown a completely different level of cooperation, and this permits me to speak optimistically and say that big changes are taking place in the world and in cooperation among countries, and, of course, between two such states as the Soviet Union and the United States of America. Here, as I said at the news conference, whether we want it or not, and this is not ambition or pretension, history has made it so, a particular responsibility lies with them.

But after all, let's remember times not so far away. Have not individual countries had ambitions to rule the world, to play the role of the world gendarme in the world, and to decide, both on their own and arbitrarily, the destinies of peoples and so on? All this has gone.

[Correspondent] To clarify, this is the opinion of the Soviet delegation. Is it possible to say now that the U.S. delegation has the same opinion, that those times are now past?

[Gorbachev] Well, you know, the president in our conversation—and the conversation began with this, with, so to speak, philosophical part—and it was also noted in our comrades' conversations that yet, if everything that happened as a result of Malta, Washington, and Camp David had not happened, this meeting would not have happened. I can see great sense, first of all, in this meeting which I would say further cemented the solidity of, well, such approaches, such position.

[Correspondent] And the second question which, without exaggeration, is of interest for millions of people in our country. The session of the USSR Supreme Soviet begins its work tomorrow. The situation in the country is not easy. And to put in frankly and directly, it is severe. As a consequence of today's negotiations, are there any results of an economic nature which will be useful and valuable for the USSR and republican Supreme Soviets?

[Gorbachev] First of all, I should say that I came across their great knowledge of what is happening in our country. And this means that what we are doing is very important for us and for everybody. And on the other hand the subject of the nature of our cooperation nowadays has arisen. I would like to say that the U.S. Administration and, probably, political and public circles as well have passed through the certain stage of, yes, reflections. And today we were, if you like, satisfied with the approach, with the fact that they, first of all, think that the world community is planning and will and is striving to and will cooperate with the Soviet Union for it to succeed in resolving its problems more quickly. But at the same time the cooperation is mutually beneficial. The second thing, we simply discussed specific projects. This covered the implementation of projects in the more rational use of our minerals, which we are already mining but do not always use effectively. They have technology, which they described, and proposals to ensure a better use of this raw material and better ecology.

The area of power engineering generally interests them. We spoke of cooperation in aircraft construction. The President gave a promise, it seems to me, to remove all the obstacles existing on the American side. This is the implementation of a project for the production of a new type of civil aircraft which has great prospects on the international market. This is a very important, large-scale deal, perhaps, and a great piece of business. Well, that is indeed conversion.

There was discussion of other projects: the Arkhangelsk project—they are ready to respond to taking part in cooperation. A lot of other areas were mentioned, including to do with an exchange, let's say, of experience—we have such an expression—in managing affairs in the framework of the functioning of a market economy, and an exchange in training cadres for these conditions.

There was also discussion of financial resources, of the possibilities for solving this problem too. But I must say all this was mentioned, these subjects all came up, but we agreed that in three days Minister Baker will be in the Soviet Union, and with him there will come a large group of... [changes thought] the minister of trade is coming and a large group of businessmen for a specific, detailed examination of all these prospects for cooperation.

And the United States of America—at least this subject was raised—will help and not hinder in making cooperation with other countries develop more successfully. Why? Because often, when we start cooperation with one country or another, we come up against the fact that there are licenses from the United States, and a ban because of them. There came from the lips of the President of the United States an understanding of the fact that this also has to be borne in mind if this cooperation is to gather strength.

Well, of course, we too need to do a lot. We need to solve questions on the legislative side, to solve questions connected with foreign investments—all our contractors ought to be clear on what conditions these are based. Anyway, this subject was there in depth, and it is a good thing that it will get such real, specific content in Moscow. I think that this is a serious step on the road to deeper, sounder links, in the sphere of technology exchange, which up until now American companies did not really embark on. Today the position... [changes thought], and this was held up by the position of the country's leadership, political questions, one could say. Today we think that things are changing in this regard.

So this subject was there. This subject was there.

[Correspondent] Many thanks, Mikhail Sergeyevich, and congratulations to you and the whole of our delegation on the end of these talks. It seems they were successful.

[Gorbachev] Yes, I think we can use the words you used, and I think there was a great sense of responsibility on the part of these two states for the fate of their own peoples and states, and for the world. This bears a promise of reaching new forms of cooperation and a higher degree of trust. And these are very important prerequisites.

Moscow TV Reports Assessments of Summit

LD0909155990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1326 GMT 9 Sep 90

[Video report by correspondents S. Slipchenko and D. Biryukov]

[Text] [Correspondent] Late yesterday evening, the first results of the Helsinki meetings were made public. Spokesmen for the Soviet delegation said a very frank and sincere discussion was held between Gorbachev and Koivisto. Above all, it had to do with economic relations, particularly since fundamental changes are in the offing in our country. The topic of ecology is an important one. There is the question of the Kola peninsula and the whole of the north of Europe. The conversation showed that Koivisto and Gorbachev have identical views of the European process and the crisis in the Persian Gulf. In brief, it was a conversation between two people who confide in each other.

This is how today began in Helsinki. In the view of the presidents of two of the world's biggest countries, much can change in the world on 9 September 1990. A long time before the meeting, journalists were warned that the presidents would not be replying to questions during the protocol meetings and the photo-calls. But early this morning reporters wanted to know at least George Bush's mood on his arrival for the start of the talks. And this smile was his reply. [video shows President and Mrs. Bush arriving in an official car. Bush smiles, waves, and gives thumbs-up sign]

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's reaction to the noisy simultaneous questions was this. [video shows Mr. and Mrs. Gorbachev arriving by car. In response to the shouted question: Are you optimistic this morning?, Gorbachev replied: Yes, and tomorrow too!]

In cold war times, confrontation gave rise to conflict between us. But today a conflagration on the planet has forced us to reach our hands out to each other. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev presented George Bush with this picture: a cartoon on the subject of the cold war. The victors are the presidents. By the way, they are depicted not without humor. And their judge is the entire planet. [video shows Gorbachev and Bush shaking hands inside building. The two smile and joke as they examine the picture]

The meeting is taking place in a picturesque location in a palace on the coast of a bay. Along the coast are hundreds of tourists, journalists, and many people who have come for the meeting. The presidents went out to greet them, admittedly through the bulletproof glass which was set up on the insistence of the U.S. side.

The greetings and smiles finish and the work begins. An extremely limited circle of individuals is taking part in the first round of talks. But a meeting between the two leaders of the countries does not just mean talks. It means a quite special atmosphere in the city.

There is also a second program at the meeting. The wives of the three presidents, the countries' first ladies, say the official and protocol ceremonies are very tiring. Thousands of eyes and lenses follow them; it is completely impossible to walk indifferently past people who wait for long periods of time in the drizzle.

This, for example, is how the presidents' wives were met in Helsinki University library. This building is situated next to the city's main cathedral and their friezes are located on the same level. This is a symbol of the fact that Finland treats books in the same way as religion. The univestity president met the guests and showed them all these treasures. This library is part of the world famous Helsinki Slavonic library. From ancient times two editions of all of the books published in Russia have been sent here. There are books here which have already been lost in our country. There is a special gallery for exhibiting books. There is a similar one in the United States, but Barbara Bush noted that this one was more convenient. Raisa Maksimova Gorbacheva thanked employees and Tellervo Koivisto for the fact that Finland was so solicitous toward Russian culture, toward our books and history. In this hall the guests were shown old maps. Among these were both old maps of America and of Russia. Journalists had previously taken up positions in this same hall and they simply insisted on a mini-news conference.

[Interpreter] What can women do to strengthen peace throughout the world?

[Raisa Gorbacheva, in Russian with simultaneous translation by interpreter into English] A great deal. We comprise 53 percent of the world's population, more than half of humanity. People can probably do a lot [words indistinct] as half of the humanity also.

[Interpreter] Do you see any chance for a diplomatic resolution of the crisis in the Persian Gulf?

[Gorbacheva] I think we will leave the answer to this question to the leaders of our two states who are meeting in Helsinki today.

[Correspondent] And this is simply an international tradition—signatures in the book for honored guests. This book is already part of history, and as the custodians noted, the signatures are a gift for the 350th anniversary of the university. [video shows Raisa Gorbachev and T.Koivisto signing the guest book]

And meanwhile the first part of the talks was finishing up and another protocol measure awaited the presidents and their wives. During the first half of the day when the leaders of the two countries began tete-a-tete talks, journalists were trying to exploit every opportunity to discover what was happening behind the closed doors, to determine the moods of the presidents and thus to attempt to forecast the degree of success of the meeting as a whole. At about 1230 the first conversation ended and Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, George Bush, and Finnish President Mauno Koivisto, in whose residence the meeting is being held as well as the presidents' wives, came out into a small hall to provide an oportunity for the next page of photo and film chronicles to be made for history. The most impatient tried to get answers to their questions.

[Gorbachev] Let us answer your questions [words indistinct] at the news conference.

[Unidentified reporter] But are you satisfied with the talks?

[Correspondent] And several minutes later Vitaliy Ignatenko and Marlin Fitzwater held an operational meeting with the press. The journalists' questions concerned the content and the subjects of the talks and, naturally, the degree of unity [words indistinct].

[Ignatenko in Russian, with simultaneous translation into English] The meeting began at 1007. It lasted two hours and 50 minutes. I think it would be fair if my colleague and friend Marlin Fitzwater begin first since Mr. Bush spoke at this session first.

[Fitzwater, in English with superimposed Russian translation] The presidents had a very productive meeting this morning. They held one-to-one talks for almost three hours and did not even expand the number of those taking part in the talks. The meeting was almost wholly devoted to the crisis in the Persian Gulf and we are united—the Soviet Union and the United States—adhere to united and firm views on the situation and on

the significance of the UN resolution, of course, and on the necessity for an intensification of the sanctions against the aggressor.

[Ignatenko] A tete-a-tete meeting has just taken place. A more extended meeting still lies ahead.

PRAVDA Sees 'New Stage' in Relations

PM0909195990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Sep 90 Second Edition pp 1,5

[Article by special correspondents T. Kolesnichenko and Yu. Kuznetsov: "When Doors Open..."]

[Excerpt] Helsinki, 9 Sep—[passage omitted] Helsinki's life is part of international reality, and currently—as one newly arrived journalist put it—the city has become the "political capital of the world."

But it is more important to note, perhaps, that, while taking this place in the world's consciousness, Finland is actually showing how important it is—even for a small neutral country—to act from a position of profound interest. It will now probably be hard for us to stand aside from international conflicts by citing a desire not to interfere in the disputes of the great powers, Finnish President M. Koivisto noted the other day, referring to the fundamentally altered situation whereby the world's leading states are essentially acting together in a desire to maintain and strengthen peaceful conditions for mankind's existence.

"International policy has in many respects lost its ideological overtones, not least thanks to Moscow's new foreign policy," HUFVUDSTADSBLADET, one of Helsinki's leading newspapers, writes. In this situation the tasks of safeguarding common human values and fundamental human ideals as well as ensuring a businesslike approach to relations between states are coming to the fore. For many countries there is no longer any need to "pick sides" with one or other great power. Political practice is being cleansed in its own way so as to really serve the interests of all countries—irrespective of their size or membership of blocs and social systems.

In this sense the "Helsinki Summit '90," in our view, contains more than might have seemed the case a week ago, when the "one-day contact" between the Soviet and U.S. presidents was unexpectedly announced. It is now no longer enough just to say: "There's been contact!" It is a question of a new stage in both Soviet-U.S. relations and in all world history.

Of course, any observer can only dream of learning what is actually being said in the Finlandia Palace—where the working meeting is being held—before this evening's joint Soviet-U.S. news conference. But, after all, a range of issues is known about on the whole—and the main point is the businesslike desire of both presidents to resolve those issues constructively.

Some observers' heads are spinning when they consider the possible prospects. "Just think"—some of them say excitedly, unable to tear themselves away from the televsion screens depicting the doors behind which the talks will be held in one of the halls of the presidential palace—"just think, if the USSR and the United States act together, we'll be able to save the environment, the bloodshed in regional conflicts will stop, and we'll be able to feed people in disaster areas." Yes, such things are being said like cliches, and there is great sense to them.

But wiser heads are not getting euphoric. A highly experienced special correspondent with the respected WALL STREET JOURNAL expressed doubt: "The USSR and the United States have different interests and different allies in the Near East." Different is right, but we would add (and happily this was mentioned by U.S. television itself) that it was not just us but the United States as well that armed Iraq and sold it state-of-the-art military hardware not so long ago. How many weapons does Israel receive, and does Washington intend to "stay put" in the Near and Middle East and place the oil wealth under its military control? There are many questions. And when journalists weary with the lack of news start putting them to each other you get as a result not answers but even more involved questions.

And we remembered Reykjavik. Why did that meeting, which did not end in any specific results, go down in history as an example of a previously unprecedented outstanding "breakthrough"—as the Americans like to put it? Because there, in the Icelandic capital, President Gorbachev and then-U.S. President Reagan managed for a time to rise above the banal standard-issue solutions to attain a truly fantastic level. And history "registered" that. Perhaps it was more a question then of intuition and illumination. But today, after Malta and Washington, when improvisation has given way to sober calculation and when trust has become not just a moral but a prosaically regulated form of diplomacy, it can be said that the name of the city of Helsinki will become a kind of shorthand when talk turns to joint Soviet-U.S. actions to solve complex problems that until yesterday had seemed insoluble.

Journalists were briefed on the first results of the two leaders' talks at a midday joint briefing held by V.N. Ignatenko, aide to the USSR president and leader of the press service, and M. Fitzwater, aide to the U.S. President and White House press secretary. The Soviet spokesman reported that the first round of talks, which the presidents had conducted one-on-one, had lasted two hours 50 minutes. His American colleague stressed that the presidents had a good meeting, which was almost wholly devoted to the situation in the Persian Gulf. We are united: The Soviet Union and the United States are very serious about the situation in that region. Bush and Gorbachev discussed the corresponding UN resolutions and intend to jointly strive for their full implementation. In Ignatenko's words, the Soviet president made a very optimistic assessment of the results of the first round. The meeting was held in a very constructive spirit. This

atmosphere was created at Camp David during Gorbachev's visit to the United States last summer, and the sides reaffirmed it. There was a very important discussion about the role of the United Nations.

It was reported at the briefing that a meeting was held today between USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker.

The Soviet and U.S. presidents talked in detail about the contents of the talks and the decisions adopted at them at their joint news conference in the evening.

Officials View Summit in Light of Gulf Crisis

Shevardnadze Views Agenda

LD0709211290 Moscow TASS in English 2048 GMT 7 Sep 90

[By TASS diplomatic correspondent Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] Moscow September 7 TASS—There are many issues on the agenda of the upcoming Soviet-U.S. summit in Helsinki that require urgent consideration, above all the Gulf crisis and the Cambodian settlement," USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze told Soviet journalists on board the IL-62M aircraft en route to Moscow after his official visit to Japan.

The meeting of the Soviet and American presidents in Helsinki is expected to identify landmarks and directions for the solution of the burning issues of the day, the minister continued to say.

"Settling the Persian Gulf crisis by peaceful means through the U.N. Security Council mechanism is a top priority.

"If a more resolute action is needed, the U.N. military staff committee should be used to settle the conflict.

"We expect that a substantial discussion will be held in the capital of Finland relating to ways to stimulate the Arab factor in order to overcome the crisis," Shevardnadze noted.

"We shall seek to combine the efforts of those with whom we have good relations and those with whom the United States has good relations in order to find a way out of the crisis.

"Of course," Shevardnadze said, "there are no foolproof recipes for solving the conflict. In this connection, I proposed, and so- to-say "resuscitated" the idea of an international Middle East conference.

"If only we succeeded in convoking such a conference—with the participation of the conflicting sides, U.N. Security Council member-countries and, maybe, some others—it would become possible to consider the Persian Gulf situation already at its first stage, while devoting the second stage to the consideration of the situation on occupied Arab territories, i.e. the whole set of problems relating to the Arab-Israeli conflict.

"The third stage should be devoted to the Lebanese issue. This conference would undoubtedly stress the role of the Arab factor," the Soviet minister noted.

"I believe that this plan can be realized, although, as far as I know, the U.S. secretary of state views it without much enthusiasm. But I think one should not be scared by this idea.

"If the need arises," Shevardnadze stressed, "I am ready to travel to Iraq. It will probably be necessary to do some work with Israel at the ministerial level. But, I want to reiterate, there is no need to fear such a conference. What needs to be feared is the consequences of an exacerbated conflict. If the issue is not solved soon, its consequences can prove intimidating indeed".

"As regards the Cambodian settlement," Shevardnadze said, "I was told that James Baker had announced on Thursday that the United States was prepared to establish a contact with the Hun Sen government. These are very serious shifts on the part of the United States, it is a very significant step.

"The idea is not new in itself—I spoke on the subject with the secretary of state—but now that the stance of the American side has changed, I—for my part—am ready to establish a contact with Norodom Sihanouk," Shevardnadze said.

"It is very important at present. If the Supreme National Council is formed, we shall come very close to solving the issue. The plan for a Cambodian settlement should not be put off. Its realization may, perhaps, begin immediately, with holding a respective working meeting as soon as possible," Shevardnadze stressed.

Bush Aide Praises Soviet Role

LD1009085590 Moscow TASS in English 0842 GMT 10 Sep 90

[Text] New York September 10 TASS—Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs Brent Scowcroft told the NBC television network on Sunday that the joint statement issued after the Helsinki summit was a "historical document". He noted that the toughening of the Soviet and U.S. stand on the fulfilment of U.N. resolutions to settle the Gulf conflict was of historical significance.

Scowcroft said the Soviet Union plays a very responsible role in the settlement of the current Gulf crisis.

Finnish Leader on Hostages

LD0809105190 Moscow TASS in English 1037 GMT 8 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Voitto Leskinen]

[Text] Helsinki September 8 TASS—Iraq must release all hostages and withdraw from Kuwait unconditionally, President Mauno Koivisto of Finland told the HELSINGIN SANOMAT newspaper, published today.

Commenting on the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Helsinki, Koivisto said the talks would apparently focus on efforts to create a new security system in the Middle East.

He pointed out that there is no need to take tougher measures against Iraq than the already imposed economic sanctions.

"The U.N. economic sanctions helped create a very efficient system of pressure on Iraq, which has reduced the risk of war in the Gulf," Koivisto said.

He said governments should "maintain faith in U.N. economic sanctions and abide by this policy."

The president said he did not believe that the situation in the gulf could be defused by sending more military forces to the region. "It is possible that they could cause more confusion and mix-up than usefulness," he said.

Koivisto rejected the idea of making a deal with Iraq to release hostages in exchange for food supplies.

Official Expectations of Helsinki Summit Noted

French Leader Sees 'Solidarity'

PM0709222190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Article by IZVESTIYA correspondent Yu. Kovalenko: "F. Mitterrand's Opinion"]

[Text] Paris—"I expect a great deal from the forthcoming summit between M.S. Gorbachev and G. Bush. Not in terms of sensational decisions but in terms of confirming the solidarity between these two great powers," French President F. Mitterrand has stated at an Elysee Palace news conference.

"The Soviet and U.S. presidents," Mitterrand went on to say, "are meeting at a time when the situation is extremely serious, and that is why we need to know whether the two powers' positions coincide in order to ensure that right triumphs, that the present Iraqi leader retreats, and that we can get back to genuinely peaceful relations."

The French president again advocated strict observance of the embargo—on whose success the settlement of the conflict depends—without resorting to hostilities or unleashing war.

Paris, as observers commenting on Mitterrand's statement believe, is adopting a moderate position regarding events in the Gulf, intends to act strictly within the framework of the UN resolutions, and will not follow the United States if it decides to attack Baghdad. That was the essence of the French president's message to Bush on the eve of his meeting with Gorbachev.

The U.S. strategy from the very outset of the crisis, the newspaper LE FIGARO writes, has been to force Saddam Husayn to make a mistake in order to make him easier to eliminate. Mitterrand stated at the news conference that he disagrees with this approach.

UK's Thatcher Wishes Success

LD0809062190 Moscow TASS in English 0614 GMT 8 Sep 90

[Text] London September 8 TASS—It has been learnt here that British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher sent a message to Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev, expressing hope that the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit will signal to the Iraqi leadership that gains cannot be reaped from aggression.

The message calls for the Soviet Union and the United States to demonstrate commitment to the goals laid down in the U.N. Security Council resolutions on the Gulf crisis.

Thatcher wished success to the participants in the Soviet-U.S. summit.

Pre-Summit Commentaries View U.S., Soviet Aims

Bush Awaits 'Active Support'

PM0709145190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Article by correspondent A. Shalnev: "Help, But on Condition..."]

[Text] New York—President Bush is ready to offer President Gorbachev "some extra help" in developing the Soviet economy in exchange for more active support by Moscow for Washington's efforts in opposing Saddam Husayn. This was reported on Wednesday by NBC, citing information obtained in the White House.

According to this information, this could involve, in particular, "engineering help to enable the Soviet Union to extract more oil." I would like to note in this regard that, according to the estimates of Western experts cited by the WASHINGTON POST, the Soviet Union is extracting half a million fewer barrels of oil per day this year than last.

It is also expected that President Bush will take with him to Helsinki a team of 15 leading captains of American industry so that they can, as NBC reported, discuss the question of private investment in the USSR economy with the Soviet representatives accompanying President Gorbachev.

What specifically will Washington demand in exchange? There have been no leaks on this score so far, and therefore one can only make assumptions of a purely general nature, placing them within the context of the very acute budgetary problems with which the United States is contending and which will only grow with the buildup and consolidation of the American military presence in the Persian Gulf region. As people will be aware, Secretary of State Baker made it known when

speaking in Congress the other day that the administration intends to ensure a long-term U.S. military presence in the Persian Gulf region even if Iraq agrees to withdraw its troops from Kuwait.

How much will this cost? Pentagon specialists calculate (this, by the way, is yet another leak to NBC) at least $15 billion in the first six months of the new fiscal year, which starts 1 October. This is in addition to the $3 billion to be spent in September.

The sums are vast, and it is precisely those sums which Secretary of State Baker and Secretary of the Treasury Brady have in mind as they now pursue strenuous efforts to persuade their allies to assume a greater share than they do at present of the burden involved in overcoming the Persian Gulf crisis. Judging by the debate which resulted from the secretary of state's speech at the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings on Wednesday, discontent at the allies' pretty low level of activity is growing in Congress. Senator Kerry of Massachusetts wondered why, for example, the ground forces in the region are almost wholly American. In answer Baker hinted: "I hope that additional troops will appear there."

In the prevailing situation in the Persian Gulf Congress regards the Soviet Union as America's ally. Baker once more gave grounds for such assessments when he stated at the Wednesday hearings: "We are very content with the way the Soviet government is responding and reacting (to the situation)."

Which is indeed why the question of the Soviet military advisers in Iraq is being raised with increasing sharpness. Raised by American legislators, according to whose estimates the advisers number 5,000-6,000. This figure was cited at the Wednesday hearings by Senator Cohen, who accused Moscow of adopting an "ambiguous" posture. "We will continue dialogue with Moscow on this topic," the secretary of state assured the legislators, after hearing Senator Dodd answer: "We will be following this carefully." (As is well known, the number of Soviet military specialists in Iraq, according to official Soviet figures, is under 200—editorial office).

In general terms, the Foreign Relations Committee hearings showed that the inhabitants of Capitol Hill are ready to give the Bush administration their support—powerful but not unlimited support. Some Senators did not agree with Bush's decision to write off $7 billion of debt accumulated by Egypt—to write if off as a sign of gratitude for helping operations in the region; there are Senators—among them the influential Joseph Biden—who are surprised that Washington is seeking to restore the regime of the Emir of Kuwait, since they consider the regime repressive; there are those who demand a tighter blockade of Iraq and, in particular, the extension of the blockade to commercial air routes; and there are also those who are not averse to reminding the administration that it opposed the introduction of economic sanctions against Baghdad just seven days before Iraq invaded Kuwait.

But the most important thing, NBC commentator Andrea Mitchell stressed, is that Congress is seeking proof of the "Soviet Union's intention to stop military support for Saddam Husayn."

And, by all the evidence, George Bush's readiness to give extra help to the Soviet economy will be linked to this proof in Helsinki.

Issues More Complex Now

PM0709164190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Sep 90 Morning Edition pp 1,4

[Article by IZVESTIYA correspondent A. Shalnev: "Transatlantic Forecasts. What People in the United States Are Saying on the Eve of the Soviet-U.S. Summit"]

[Text] New York—Judging by the preliminary timetable for the Helsinki summit, Presidents Gorbachev and Bush will spend a total of seven hours in each other's company. Including a one-hour break for a working lunch and a one-hour joint news conference.

Even taking account of the fact that translation will be simultaneous and therefore the time available for talking will not be halved, it will not be possible to discuss a great many matters. A great deal will clearly remain outside the top leaders' direct attention and will be passed on down to close advisers and aides who will, of course, be holding their own discussions—with only the slight difference that they will not be entitled to make any final decisions.

In principle such meetings—brief meetings in a very informal atmosphere—certainly need not be assessed in terms of success or failure. It is already important that they are regularly held without having to be agreed months beforehand—they can be set up with just a few transatlantic phone calls.

But we cannot fail to see that this summit is set in the context of quite different events and phenomena from previous summits. There were no situations then as critical as the current situation—either in the international sphere or, even more, in the domestic sphere. The need not just to exchange opinions and to listen to and understand each other's views, but to make key decisions seems to me far more serious and topical now than it was a year ago.

The situation in the Gulf will, naturally, not be the only subject discussed by the two presidents in the Finnish capital. Washington, it seems to me, would like to play its own game in the current conflict, leaving everyone else to play a supporting role, but a role which would ease the burden of the United States itself—a financial burden, incidentally. It is noteworthy, after all, that, while welcoming the cooperation and support from Moscow, the administration is nonetheless telling the Soviet Union very clearly: "Your mediation on this is not needed, there already are mediators." America, that is.

Mark Leventhal, a ranking official with the Congressional Research Service, believes: "Only the United States is a global superpower whose support is sought in crisis situations like that in the Gulf. The Soviet Union has the unenviable right to choose between being obstructive and concurring. It can prevent something happening, but it cannot make something happen." Sadly, it has to be admitted that M. Leventhal is by no means alone in his views, not only among academics but even in government circles. I would quote THE NEW YORK TIMES, which, citing an administration staffer who wished to remain anonymous, wrote: "Although the two countries are cooperating to a considerable extent in the Gulf, their interests and policies are not identical. Both sides agree on the need to prevent aggression and remove Saddam Husayn from Kuwait. But they differ on everything else."

America does not need intermediaries, but events are, after all, developing just a few hundred miles from Soviet borders, and developing in such a way that they cannot fail to influence—if only psychologically—the USSR's Muslim population. However, despite the scope and unusual complexity of the problems bound up with the Gulf conflict, the Americans setting off for Finland quite obviously want to focus on a single aspect—the problem of Soviet military advisers in Iraq: Moscow should immediately withdraw them, Washington is demanding.

And there is a clear sense that this problem will be bound up—probably directly rather than indirectly—with the range of issues concerning the Soviet economy and the role that America could play in that area.

This, it seems to me, will be the main set of issues on the Helsinki summit agenda. Bush is going there to listen: He will be interested in everything—the Soviet president's detailed analysis of the economic situation in the USSR, assessments of the prospects for the transition to the market, and forecasts of the political viability of current leaders, including Gorbachev himself.

It is clear to the White House that it will have to make some amendments to its policy as regards the USSR. In fact, the process of modification is already under way. Without abandoning what THE NEW YORK TIMES called its "all-out stake on Gorbachev," the administration has already started working with people previously considered in opposition but who are increasingly gaining power.

In my view a more substantial indicator of the changes that are taking place is the fact that, according to a report in the weekly U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, the idea is increasingly gaining ground in Washington that Western—including U.S.—aid should be given directly to the republics rather than via central departments. "Soviet academics who emigrated during the eighties" are among those who support the idea for such aid—an idea which, the weekly admits, could possibly stimulate the "collapse of the union and the weakening of Gorbachev's presidential authority."

I fully admit that this version of "aid" has not yet won over top government officials. But we can assume that the assessments and impressions which Bush and his team of advisers form in Helsinki will prepare the ground for the adoption of a corresponding decision on this score. Most likely this decision will be in favor of decentralization.

Continuing the theme of aid to the Soviet Union or its republics, it should be noted that a considerable gap may easily emerge between the promises which President Bush may be inclined to make in the Finnish capital and his real actions. The "ditch diggers" include, in particular, members of Congress, who are not overly inclined to grant the former "evil empire" any aid—even purely technical aid. In the opinion of the CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY, bills concerning questions of aid to the USSR have an "uncertain future."

And the journal said this more than a month after everyone at the Houston, Texas conference of leaders of the capitalist world's "big seven" had seemingly agreed on the need to help Moscow. To help it technically, with experts, for instance.

Of course, there is nothing surprising about this: There have been examples of this in very recent history. For instance, the trade agreement concluded during Gorbachev's June visit to Washington was shelved almost immediately—by both the administration and Congress.

And what about the Jackson-Vanik amendment, which deprived us of most-favored-nation status in trade with America! (I am leaving aside the fact that even if the amendment were repealed, little would change: We have nothing to supply to the Americans—even free of tariffs). The conditions on which the amendment could be repealed have essentially been met by us—this can be judged from the hundreds of thousands of emigration applications filed at the U.S. Embassy in Moscow. But we have right away been set new conditions. The result is that Jackson-Vanik is still with us.

The members of Congress are in no hurry. Nor is the administration. Nor are business people eager for the fray.

Will things be clearer for businessmen after Helsinki? To a certain extent yes, but hardly entirely. And can we ourselves give an unambiguous answer to all the questions which business people are asking? Of course not. Can we even answer the following question, for instance: Where are all those 100 million pounds' worth of consumer goods which Central Committee Secretary Biryukova bought in Britain a year ago? They were bought for the masses with great fanfare and publicity. I have still not met a single person who can say: "Yes, I have seen a pair of those tights in a store with my own eyes."

I suspect that the Helsinki summit will raise as many questions as it resolves. Perhaps even more. Questions dictated not only by the uncertainties which have emerged and are being exacerbated in our country, but also by those with which Washington will have to grapple. Is there an economist who would dare predict—and guarantee the accuracy of the prediction—just what will become of the U.S. economy next year?

And is there a politician prepared to forecast the outcome of the Gulf crisis and, consequently, what Bush's influence and prestige will be in the world and domestic arenas?

I repeat that the circumstances of the Helsinki summit are far more complex than the circumstances of minisummits in the past. But it seems to me that there would be some merit in this summit being followed up soon by another.

There is no dodging decisions. But they need slightly more time: After all, the decisions could be historic. Without exaggeration.

'Powerful Stabilizing Factor'

PM0709214990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 8 Sep 90 First Edition p 5

["Observer's Notes" by A. Golts: "Will We Get an Answer Tomorrow?"]

[Text] So, a working meeting between the Soviet and U.S. presidents will be held in the Finnish capital tomorrow. Virtually everyone agrees that the discussion will focus on the Gulf crisis. And a number of Western and some Soviet observers believe that Washington will raise the issue of the USSR hardening its position with regard to Iraq.

It is not ruled out that this may happen. But I nonetheless think that the discussion will proceed in a different direction. And this is why. The Gulf crisis has already lasted more than a month. At the very beginning the USSR and the United States issued a joint statement sharply condemning the aggressor. Later this principled approach was reflected in resolute UN Security Council resolutions. The USSR immediately halted arms deliveries to Iraq and joined in economic sanctions.

And it should be said that U.S. representatives at all levels have expressed satisfaction with this. U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker called our country a "responsible partner" in the business of settling the crisis. And Presidential Press Secretary M. Fitzwater stated: "The Soviet Union has provided exceptional help and support. It played a key role in the discussion of the five resolutions adopted at the United Nations. And we are very grateful for this support in these conditions. They have explained that they have certain contracts which require the presence of a certain number of people there, but on the whole their citizens are leaving the country. I think that this is an understandable situation. The USSR has been linked with Iraq for a number of years. It has changed its policy in the most major fashion, and we have no doubts about its full support."

This is why, in my view, the Helsinki talks will go in a different direction. All the more so as the show of force which Washington was relying on in the initial stage of the crisis has not sobered Husayn up.

The question of possible military action against Iraq has begun to be elaborated not only by politicians but by Pentagon strategists. The results of this analysis have prompted serious concern in the U.S. leadership. Judge for yourselves. According to estimates from the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the National Security Council, U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT states, U.S. losses in a large-scale war with Iraq—allowing for the possible use of chemical weapons—could run to 20,000-30,000. And that is not counting the thousands of foreigners held hostage by Husayn.

Thus, the likelihood has emerged of major ground operations and the concomitant losses—that is, a situation which the Pentagon has been avoiding ever since the Vietnam War.

U.S. observers are pointing out in this connection that in the event of war the current unanimous approval in the United States for the President's policy could be replaced by an equally clear-cut rejection of it. And then people will see the administration's actions not as a noble desire to protect the weak and restore justice, but something else. "It will be hard for the public to swallow the fact that American boys will be dying for the sake of stable oil prices," Prof. D. Mueller stated in THE WASHINGTON POST. "We should not be carving on gravestones the information that someone died for a $25-dollar barrel of oil." All this, as U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT states, has made the U.S. President incline toward seeking diplomatic means of settlement.

And in this context there could be obvious interest for Washington in gaining detailed familiarization with the Soviet position, which—as M.S. Gorbachev has stressed—emphasizes resolving the conflict by political means. On this basis, our country has not closed off the channels of diplomatic contact with Iraq. And the USSR president's talks with that country's foreign minister are evidence of that.

But, nonetheless, the Gulf crisis will clearly not exhaust the topics for discussion at the forthcoming summit. "The foundations of a new world order are being laid, and this preparatory work will start in Helsinki," the U.S. President's press secretary noted. Thus, the agenda will undoubtedly cover the problem of German unification—all the more so as in the next few days documents will be signed on the external aspects of this unification. This problem will directly relate to the forthcoming agreement on conventional arms and armed forces reduction in Europe. Judging by everything, both leaders should give new impetus to the Vienna talks. Impetus which would ensure the conclusion of work on the agreement.

And finally, there is no doubt that Washington is highly interested in the prospects for the development of the situation in our country. After all, their attitude toward the Soviet Union as a U.S. partner will depend on how the perestroyka processes develop. Here, too, clearly, our president will have to develop the idea that both America and the entire world need a dynamic Soviet Union that is strong and integral, and that without the Soviet Union things will be harder for everyone—the United States included.

But on the whole the Helsinki summit should undoubtedly confirm that U.S.-Soviet cooperation has already become a powerful stabilizing factor in international relations. And it is probably no bad thing that at this summit there will be a flexible agenda and, consequently, a wide-ranging discussion of all problems of interest to them. After all, there will be no ritual signing of already prepared documents but direct political creativity by the heads of two great states. Creativity which could produce interesting and unexpected results.

Well, let us see what tomorrow brings.

Concern Over Gulf Shared

LD0809124190 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 7 Sep 90

["Top Priority" program presented by Sergey Goryachev, not further identified, with Sergey Plekhanov and (Viktor Kremenyuk), deputy directors of the United States and Canada Institute]

[Text] [Words indistinct] weekly panel discussion. I am Sergey Goryachev. Soviet and Americans presidents will be in Helsinki on Sunday to seize what White House Press Secretary Marlin Fitzwater described as—and I quote—an important opportunity to assess superpower interests in the post cold war period. But is it really designed (?to do) anything more than just a display of mutual concern over the Gulf crisis?

We'll talk about it today with Sergey Plekhanov to my right, who is a deputy director of the United States and Canada Institute in Moscow, and (Viktor Kremenyuk), who is another deputy director of this institute.

Welcome gentlemen, thank you. Let me begin by asking both of you to single out the interests that you think lie behind the presidents' desire to meet, what each of them wants to achieve in Helsinki? Sergey, go ahead.

[Plekhanov] Well, I think the degrees of similarity between concerns of both sides is really remarkable here. I mean there are differences; the two sides are coming to the summit, or almost summit [as heard], from different positions, but there is an unusual degree to which the interests of the two sides are parallel. Concerns are similar, and I think, of course, the uppermost concern that both sides have is to deal with the crisis in the Middle East in such a way that aggression does not go unpunished and that the status quo be restored, that Kuwait be free, but at the same time no war should break out around the Gulf.

[Goryachev] Well, it's in fashion nowadays to concentrate on similarities; probably (Viktor) will talk about differences, eh?

[(Kremenyuk)] Well, of course there are, alongside with the similarities that both presidents share over the major points of the agenda, there are differences. And the differences concern, first of all, how to react to the crisis in the Gulf. The American military buildup in the Gulf, of course, provides a possibility to press Saddam Husayn for some peaceful solution of the whole crisis and to withdraw from Kuwait and to restore the independence of that state. But at the same time, of ocurse, there is a danger of an escalation, of the military escalation of the crisis, and I think that here we have the differences in the positions of the U.S. President and the Soviet president, and they may be—may—will be discussing these differences and trying to find some joint—some joint—approach.

[Goryachev] Well, of course, the Gulf area crisis will be high on the agenda. Let's talk about that [word indistinct] with more detail, and I think that the presidents, of course, will once again demonstrate their commitment to the United Nations resolutions, taken against Iraq, that Iraq should immediately leave Kuwait. But will that be enough—this just demonstrating of their mutual commitment? Do you expect any actual steps, any results that could change the situation there?

[Plekhanov] I don't think that the situation can be changed rapidly. We should all be prepared for a long, rather protracted period of continuing pressures on Iraq to force it back from the territory that it's occupied, and so it requires patience and persistence and a great degree of consensus in the world community at the United Nations, behind the resolutions which have been adopted.

[Goryachev] well, we'll talk about diplomatic moves, and the Soviet Union has been long proposing diplomatic settlement, a peaceful settlement, this is a keystone of our policies there, but it seems to me that no results are so far achieved in a diplomatic front. I mean [the] Iraqi representative was here, there is nothing new, I didn't see anything new at his press conference the other day here in Moscow.

[Plekhanov] I don't agree with your statement that there have been no results. I think that the way the situation has evolved since the aggression of Iraq against Kuwait we've seen the world turning against Iraq, and sometimes when the world turns against you without firing a shot, that's more persuasive than firing a shot. So I think that we've seen a very significant progress in terms of applying pressure against Iraq.

[(Kremenyuk)] Well, of course, I would agree with, since, first of all, the first results of the whole thing that there is

no, any perspective of any Iraqi aggression, further aggression I mean, against Saudi Arabia. That's excluded, I think, that can be stated quite definitely. The second thing, Saddam Husayn agreed to negotiate. If you remember a week, even a week ago, he was saying: no negotiations, it's an internal affair of Iraq—just [that]—so what's there to negotiate? Now he is ready to negotiate. He has released some of the hostages, or a part of the hostages. He has shown all the signs of desire to start talks, and I think that this is already a result. But, of course, we need some more than that, and I think that in this respect, even the spectre of this U.S.- Soviet summit to discuss the issue has already worked. I mean Iraq's foreign minister visits to Moscow, his desire to convey something to Gorbachev and to convey something to both presidents, and I think that in this respect, of course, we have alredy some of the results.

[Goryachev] Talk about this quite prolonged period that should go before any results could be achieved, or any change in the situation will be achieved in the area, and it seems to me that President Bush had to take that into account, especially concerning the public opinion in the States, the worries of the taxpayers, all their huge spendings. Does Mikhail Gorbachev have to take into account any domestic developments here in the Soviet Union in his position towards the crisis in the Gulf?

[Plekhanov] I don't think that the domestic constraints here are anywhere near to those on the American side. The Americans have made a significant commitment, financial commitment. The Americans have put their troops on the ground, which turns them into a kind of a hostages in case of a small scale crisis which could blow up into a big one. But let me, let me speak about this dilemma of whether [to] continue to apply pressure and wait there in the desert and at the sea and apply the blockade, as against some kind of a quick military action. I think the quick military action is seen by responsible people, by informed people, as a very adventuristic dangerous step which could bring unforeseen consequences not only for the United States, not only for the Gulf area but for the world at large.

There have been calculations that there would be at least 100,000 losses in case a war breaks out between the United States and Iraq, 10,000 of them would be Americans. These are the calculations made by American experts. Also there is a great danger of terrorism, of chemical weapons applied in the Gulf area. There is a danger of a mortal blow to the world economy, which could go into the tailspin of a serious depression, and so on and so forth. Compared to that, spending additional monies in order to keep the blockade looks like the lesser of two evils.

[(Kremenyuk)] I would like to add also that, well, some of the U.S. allies agreed to share the burden, so that....

[Plekhanov] But, if to [as heard] come back to the domestic aspects of the situation, I think we have, that President Gorbachev also has some domestic considerations to take into account. I mean, at least, or as an example, some of the pronouncements by the Soviet generals [who] were anxious....

[(Kremenyuk)] That's what I am driving at.

[Plekhanov] ...We're anxious to stress that the American buildup in the area changes the balance, and it can be accepted or it can be approached as a possible threat to the Soviet security and so on.

[Goryachev] Excuse me, I will, I will quote James Baker, who told Congress that the United States plans to maintain a long-term military presence in the Gulf even if Iraq withdrew from Kuwait, and I think that this does worry Soviet military and probably some other people here. What do you think about, Sergey?

[Plekhanov] Well, I've seen signs. (Viktor) is right. Some generals have voiced concern about that. That point has been debated in the Soviet Union and it looks more like a traditional cold war reflex on the part of the generals. Whenever they see an American soldier, they think of (?them changing) the balance of power. I wonder why they don't think the same way about those American seamen who came to the Black Sea with a friendly visit on a cruiser. I really think that we should consider these things realistically. I don't think that the deployment of American troops around the Gulf poses a security threat to the Soviet Union.

[Goryachev] And it will not effect negotiations in Europe on conventional weapons?

[Plekhanov] I don't see a direct linkage there.

[(Kremenyuk)] I don't see either. There is a linkage, of course, since what's happening in the Gulf is, I think, the beginning of the new era, but a new era of North-South confrontation, you know, where the Soviet Union will have to choose between his previous obligations and commitments and his new political thinking. And, unfortunately, not all the people here in this country, including the military, understand that. Now we cannot also afford if something happens in the areas, (?well), in the areas which have that key importance for the world economy like the Persian Gulf, since inevitably that will also strike back our economy, our economic prospects also....

[Goryachev] Yes.

[(Kremenyuk)] ...So I think that the Soviet side should be interested equally in managing that crisis. And if the Americans do the primary job here, fine, welcome! We cannot do the same right now, but if they do it, I think that we should in a way join them and help them to contain the crisis, to put it down and to find the political solution.

[Plekhanov] That is very important: to find a political solution, because some proponents of quick military action on the American side are kind of gung ho about

this and there are some elements of the American military buildup [which] are kind of troubling. I'm talking about offensive weapons, I'm talking about the numbers and also some talk. In Washington there are reports that part of the administration is in favor of waging a war against Husayn no matter whether he withdraws from Kuwait or not, which is a very dangerous and adventuristic approach.

[Goryachev] Sergey, [words indistinct] the other day's statement by Gennadiy Gerasimov, who is a Foreign Ministry spokesman, that the Soviet Union will support United Nations' military forces in the area. Do you foresee the Soviet Union joining in military terms in the effort in the Gulf?

[Plekhanov] Well, the Soviet Union has from the start of the crisis advocated United Nations' actions and—er—because that's far more preferable to unilateral actions by any other power in the area, or any alliance like NATO. I don't think it's impossible and I think it might become necessary.

[Goryachev] What we see here is some kind of an old thinking on the part of Americans because on the other hand they say that the conflict is not between America and Iraq, it's between Iraq and the world community. That's on the one hand. On the other hand, they are reluctant to put United Nations' flag over the forces in the Gulf. Probably they do not want the Soviet Union to play a more active role there, or am I wrong?

[(Kremenyuk)] No, no, you know, the UN Security Council resolution 664, which was unanimously adopted by the permanent members of the security [as heard], it includes the possibility of using military action to support the previous resolutions on economic sanctions. And the Soviet... both the Soviet Union and the United States voted for that resolution. And in a way the Soviet Union and, more, the Soviet Union and the United States, as the permanent members of that Council, they are obliged to think about the possibility of using military force, not simply against Iraq. But, I mean, to use the military actions to support the economic sanctions which were included into the previous resolution 661. So I don't see here a big dilemma, you know. Actually, I think the Soviet Government understood when it was voting for that resolution that there can be a situation, when the Soviet Union, alongside, together with the other members of the Security Council, will have to use that force.

[Goryachev] As far as I understand, it will be only under the flag of the United Nations.

[(Kremenyuk)] Oh, yes, yes.

[Goryachev] OK. We should talk about the possible peace conference on the Middle East that was proposed by Shevardnadze a couple of days ago. The reaction in the States was mixed: it was first quite cool, then it was welcomed by Marlin Fitzwater, who said that the administration was willing to talk about this conflict. How important could this be, taking into account Israeli declarations that they would oppose any Middle East conference that would deal with the conflict between Israel and Palestinians, that they would only participate in a conference that would deal with the Gulf as itself?

[(Kremenyuk)] The idea of the Middle Eastern conference is so old, you know, and the attitude of different governments to this idea were changing all this time; so since there was no experience, why not to support this idea, why not to push it forward, but at the same time I think that there should be more, much more flexibility with the real search for peace in the Middle East [which] should include both the general conference which would, maybe, discuss all the matters, and at the same time bliateral talks, contacts, and consultations, and so on. Otherwise, you know, there is a danger that again this idea of the conference would become the bone of contention itself.

[Goryachev] Probably the conference would give Iraq a (?little) chance to step back and save face.

[Plekhanov] Well, there have got to be some negotiating avenues in order to back down from the brink, of course.

[Goryachev] Let's talk about the other possible—possible—agenda in the Helsinki meeting which [words indistinct] means that this is an economic aspect here. The administration officials say that the United States is willing to reevaluate its policies of channelling economic aid to the Soviet Union. Probably this will be discussed. On the other hand, previously the administration did not want to give any aid to the Soviet Union, saying that economic reforms in this country should first be proven. Well, frankly, I haven't seen any economic improvement in this country. So, is there a shift in American policies towards the economic aid to the Soviet Union, or is it a wrong impression?

[Plekhanov] Well, I think you're wrong in saying that there have no changes in the economic area. In the past....

[Goryachev, Interrupting] Well, it's a lot worse, if you mean that.

[Plekhanov] No, you were talking about the results.

[Goryachev] All right.

[Plekhanov] I'm talking about policies. We now have a policy which will be proposed to the Soviet parliament in a few days, and that's a good policy, that's a program which is an alternative to the old governmental program which has not worked. This new program has the authority, it has the credibility, it has the credit from the public. And it looks good, it sounds good, and so there has been a shift of gears. Gorbachev was committed to that [words indistinct].

[Goryachev] well, you talk about internal developments. Do you see any connection between Soviet-American

joint efforts in the Gulf and possible consequences of this cooperation on the economic cooperation?

[Plekhanov] well, I think definitely the fact that the Soviet Union has joined the United States in this new policy at the UN to confront the Iraqi aggression has demonstrated the cold war is over. It has had a powerful impact on foreign policy thinking in Washington about what kinds of relationship are possible with the Soviet Union. So I think it has had an impact.

[(Kremenyuk)] Sure. I also see a direct connection, since the degree of the compatibility of the interests and actions of both sides regarding the Gulf crisis would be a kind of a measure or a gauge to measure the degree of their partnership. And depending upon that, the policy of assistance with the United States will be devised towards the Soviet Union. I don't see any other way. Why should the United States help the Soviet Union if the Soviet Union continues to be a rival? It's absurd.

[Goryachev] Yes, let me ask you a final question. We have very little time left. Do you see anything that could prevent Gorbachev and Bush to have a fruitful summit? Do you see anything that could undermine the summit, anything that could lead to disagreements, to serious disagreements in Helsinki? Sergey? [Plekhanov] I'm optimistic about the summit.

[Goryachev] (Viktor)?

[(Kremenyuk] Also.

[Goryachev] Well, thank you very much. That was "Top Priority," hosted today by Sergey Goryachev. My guests were two deputy directors of the United States and Canada Studies Institute here in Moscow, Sergey Plekhanov and (?Viktor Kremenyuk). Until next week, goodbye.

'Emergency Meeting' Previewed

PM0809144790 Moscow TRUD in Russian
8 Sep 90 p 3

["Political Observer's Opinion" by P. Vorobyev: "On the Eve of an Important Dialogue"]

[Text] The forthcoming Helsinki summit between the Soviet and U.S. presidents is being seen in the world as an urgent and even emergency meeting. It is being linked above all with the tense and dangerous situation that has emerged in the Near East as a result of the Iraqi occupation of Kuwait. This is probably not the only reason making the leaders of the two great powers meet once again just three months after M.S. Gorbachev's visit to the United States. It is not the only reason, but it is undoubtedly the main reason.

The present crisis is particularly dangerous because the main participants in the confrontation find themselves, for different reasons, in virtually an impasse. Iraq, having swallowed up its neighbor, does not want to retreat or even seek ways to "save face." At the same time, the ruling regime clearly feels that international sanctions or an escalation of the conflict would ultimately lead to its downfall. The United States, having deployed a large military contingent in the region and incurring immense expenditure in that respect, is already facing the question of just how effective its policy is and how long the situation of "neither peace nor war" can continue.

Impasses often lead to an explosion. Sometimes it happens despite the wishes of the parties to the conflict, and sometimes it is planned. Some time ago it had seemed that an explosion in the Persian Gulf was inevitable and would not be long in coming. At any rate, highly belligerent statements were made. In recent days, however, signs have emerged that the United States is hardly likely to take military action in the immediate future. Major experts and influential Congressional figures are advising the administration to show restraint and give the UN-imposed economic sanctions against Iraq time to work. This is very sensible advice.

Indeed, it is simply impossible to second-guess all the negative consequences which might ensue from the use of force under U.S. auspices in the Near East. It is quite likely that there would be an "asymmetrical response," with Iraq using chemical weapons, for example. Even more likely is an anti-U.S. and anti-Western outburst on the part of the Arab masses, with unpredictable consequences for moderate regimes in the region. Numerous casualties would be unavoidable. The further development of the conflict cannot be predicted and is extremely dangerous for literally everyone. That is why there is no doubt that the Soviet president will talk to G. Bush about circumspection and restraint—things which, it must be said, do not always come easily to Americans with their traditional strong-arm instincts.

What is happening now in the Near East merits serious discussion at top level and on a broader plane. We are facing the first international crisis since the end of the "cold war" between East and West. Of course, the surmounting of confrontation between the USSR and the United States reduces the direct danger of the conflict escalating into a global confrontation. That is a colossal plus. But it has to be admitted that the first crisis under the new conditions has turned out to be unpredictable and something that the great powers' diplomats and intelligence officers had not reckoned on. I would be in no rush to blame them for that. The fact is that, judging by everything, the less predictable development of international affairs will be a phenomenon which we will now have to deal with. Quite possibly for a long time to come.

The question arises: How should the USSR and the United States act? What is their role? Hasn't their ability to influence the development of events been reduced? Is it not the case that a confrontational but understandable and predictable world that was easier to "control" will be replaced by chaos and international lawlessness? I do not think that the answers to these questions fall easily to

hand. They will have to be persistently sought in the basis of new thinking and the balance of interests.

Clearly, this process will be considerably eased if the great powers eschew more vigorously the legacy and consequences of the old conflicts engendered by the "cold war." I am thinking, in particular, of the conflicts in Afghanistan, Cambodia, and southern Africa. It has repeatedly been said that the final settlement of these conflicts is not far off. But it will not be easy to travel the last part of the way. The accretions of the past and the inertia of mistrust and suspicion are taking their toll. We need political impetus at the highest level to ensure that decisive steps are finally taken. It is clear that in the new situation these conflicts do not seriously affect our countries' political, economic, or other fundamental interests. Yet considerable funds are still expended on them. It is time to bring this to an end.

One other important point: Despite all the acuteness of the situation connected with the Gulf conflict we must not allow our priority attention to wander from disarmament issues. It is worrying that the current deterioration of the situation has prompted talk in some areas about the need to virtually halt the arms reduction and limitation process. This, of course, would be a big mistake. Political, economic, and even military factors are in favor of the vigorous continuation of this process. The very number of weapons in the world makes any conflict even more dangerous, and sometimes provokes outbreaks of tension. The USSR and the United States, by stepping up disarmament talks and taking them to their logical conclusion, can and should set an example for other countries.

There can be no doubt that the Helsinki summit will also discuss questions of bilateral relations and economic cooperation. The U.S. position on these issues is quite contradictory. Best wishes for the success of Soviet perestroyka are accompanied by various riders. The United States is in no hurry to join in the West European countries' specific steps. However, a substantive new factor is now appearing: A plan for the stabilization and radical reform of the Soviet economy, which will be submitted to the Supreme Soviet in a few days' time and which, incidentally, has already been very positively received by prestigious economists in the United States and other countries. This, it seems to me, removes one of the objections put forward by the U.S. Administration against the granting of credits to the USSR. But, apart from quite sensible objections of an economic nature, the United States, as is well known, has also laid down political conditions. It is possible that they will be discussed in Helsinki. I think, though, that these conditions are hardly likely to be adopted—however hard the economic situation in our country may be.

Thus, it can be assumed that there will be no shortage of topics for discussion at the meeting between the Soviet and U.S. presidents. It is good that the two countries' leaders have agreed to hold working meetings without protocol ceremonies more often. This is an indicator of the new level of relations between them and, above all, of the opportunity for a serious political discussion of our countries' roles and actions in today's world. This world has seen the appearance not just of new prospects but of new dangers too. These should act as an incentive for even more vigorous and honest collaboration between the USSR and the United States, on which a very great deal in world affairs continues to depend.

'New Quality' of Ties Seen

PM0809160590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Article by special correspondents S. Kondrashov and V. Shmyganovskiy: "Time To Check Positions"]

[Excerpts] Helsinki—[passage omitted] Gorbachev and Bush are rapidly gaining experience in direct contacts, demonstrating—at summit level—the new quality of relations between the two powers. This is their third meeting in less than a year. It is just three months since the Washington summit, and Malta was last December. Helsinki, like Malta, is an unplanned meeting—in both cases the initiative came from the U.S. President. Bush raised the idea while on summer vacation. It is no secret why.

Malta followed the fall of the Berlin Wall, which was at that time the culmination of the historic changes that have altered the face of Eastern Europe. Helsinki has been prompted by the development of the crisis in the Persian Gulf. What path lies ahead? After all, having seized Kuwait, Iraq does not intend to leave, despite the five Security Council resolutions. The Helsinki agenda does not boil down to this single hot problem, but it will undoubtedly dominate the talks. It is reported that one of the two meetings between the U.S. and Soviet presidents at the Finnish president's palace will be wholly given over to it.

We must give the Americans their due: They have made the greatest effort to curb the aggressor by transferring more than 100,000 of their own soldiers, sailors, and airmen to the conflict zone and acting more vigorously than others in elaborating the above resolutions adopted since the beginning of August by the Security Council. Their stakes are higher, too—namely, control over Near East oil, which is vitally important to the United States and its allies. That is why Bush proposed meeting in Helsinki.

The press has been unrestrained in its commentaries. And certain Western press organs have seen this emergency meeting as a sign of battles to come—they allege that Bush has come to win Gorbachev's assent. But many people, nonetheless, are closer to the view expressed in THE LOS ANGELES TIMES, in particular. "The very fact that this meeting is being held," the newspaper believes, "makes it harder for the United States to initiate military action. Economic sanctions remain an alternative to war," the newspaper goes on, "but they need patience. And that is not America's strongest suit."

There are other restraining factors too. According to calculations submitted to the White House by General N. Schwarzkopf, commander of the U.S. troops in the Gulf, a conflict with Iraq could result in approximately 5,000 Americans being killed or wounded. For all his resolve it will be hard for Bush to obtain the approval of his country's public for such losses.

It is clear that the Soviet leader will be calling for a political solution to the problem—something which our side has repeatedly stated. Incidentally, as we have already said, the talks will not focus solely on this explosive problem. They are far broader and will undoubtedly continue established traditions. [passage omitted]

The summit is part of the broad context of the intensive diplomatic fall of 1990 in Europe.

Europe is entering a new period in which peaceful prospects beckon. However, this period is also fraught with surprises and new dangers—not least outside Europe. Speaking on Capitol Hill Tuesday, Secretary of State Baker formulated the challenge of the new era: "Iraq's unprovoked aggression is a political test of how the post-cold War world will work," he said. "We face a simple choice: Do we want to live in a world where aggression is made less likely because it is met with a powerful response from the international community, a world where civilized laws apply? Or are we willing to live in a world where aggression will go unchecked because we cannot muster the collective will to rebuff it?"

The collective will already exists—first and foremost thanks to Soviet-U.S. cooperation, which has not allowed the conflict to escalate into rivalry between the two powers (as would have been the case in the past). Will the collective will be effective? How can this be ensured? The world is expecting an answer from Gorbachev and Bush.

Husayn is still ignoring this will. Moreover, he is calling for a "holy war" against the U.S. troops in Saudi Arabia and against King Fahd, who has allowed the "infidel" into the land of the Muslim holy places. His representative, Tariq 'Aziz, visiting Moscow the other day and meeting with Gorbachev, essentially reaffirmed the invariability of Iraq's aggressive course. The political means on which—and on which alone—Moscow is relying have not yet worked, regrettably. So what should we do? Leave things to the military? This, all else apart, is a question of time and the development of the situation. Nonetheless, we need to give economic sanctions a chance to demonstrate their effectiveness. Moscow favors this approach, and Bush will probably hear about it from Gorbachev.

Although amassing its military might in the Arab sands and adjoining waters, Washington also prefers peaceful means of resisting aggression, but it is keeping the military option open as well. There is a growing mood among the American and other Western publics in favor of a powerful strike against Husayn. This should be restrained—without, however, giving Iraq the illusion that it will succeed in overcoming the collective will. The Helsinki summit is important as a show of unity. Saddam Husayn should be convinced of the firmness of the new Soviet-U.S. alliance. Secretary of State Baker is right: It will be a test of the changing world order. [passage omitted]

Everyone realizes that there must be a quick solution to the main point on the summit agenda—the elimination of the seat of tension in the Gulf. As long as the confrontation of large masses of troops and modern weapons continues, a "shooting war" could break out between the sides at any time. As people are saying behind the scenes at the summit, it could be triggered by a misinterpreted radar signal.

Here too we cannot fail to recognize that the main decisionmaking burden falls to Bush. That is why the U.S. President decided on this urgent and largely unprecedented summit.

Many Issues To Be Resolved

PM0809164590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Sep 90 First Edition pp 1-2

[Article by special correspondents T. Kolesnichenko and Yu. Kuznetsov: "Helsinki Takes Up the Baton. Summit Between Soviet and U.S. Presidents Held Today. On the Agenda: Problems, Problems... Finding Unusual Solutions to Problems. World Expects Results"]

[Excerpt] Helsinki, 8 Sep—[passage omitted] Certain commentators are calling this summit unexpected. Is this the case? After all, the Soviet and U.S. leaders have firmly agreed to hold regular meetings. Such meetings have proved their usefulness and even necessity, allowing a timely verification of policy in the contentious and sometimes dangerous waters of international relations and helping us to avoid the reefs on which the ship of our civilization could founder.

In this respect such global problems as a 50-percent cut in strategic offensive weapons or conventional arms reduction in Europe will undoubtedly be subjects at the Helsinki talks. Their resolution has clearly been held up recently and needs additional new impetus. If unusual solutions to these problems are found in Helsinki, the working meeting will rebound to the two presidents' credit.

We think that the sphere of bilateral Soviet-U.S. relations should not be left to one side either. Now that we are feeling the breath of the approaching market ever more clearly at home and that the Soviet economy is truly in a crisis, the USSR is not at all indifferent to the stance that the United States will adopt with regard to trade and economic cooperation with our country. It is not a question of "first aid" or some kind of urgent "injections" of dollars. It is simply time for Washington to remove all the obstacles in this sphere. And it is

important to remember how advantageous it is for America itself to have in the USSR an economically strong and stable partner.

One last but extremely important point which more than anything determined the urgency of this "snap" summit is the situation in the Persian Gulf. We would note that this is the first international crisis to emerge since the official "funeral rites" of the "cold war." Yesterday's scenario would easily have placed the USSR and the United States on different sides of the barricades in this situation. Iraq would have remained a "progressive regime" and the United States would have been the "aggressor" with an "anti-Arab" policy. What about now? Are we really on the same side of the barricades? Is the United States really as selfless in this conflict as even our internati nal observers are persistently implying to readers? Of course not. It has its strategic interests too. The oil crisis syndrome—the specte of which terrifies the United States, forcing it to take up arms—is of no little importance either. All the more so as the United States is quite accustomed to this reflex of taking up arms. Washington retains close ties to Tel Aviv, which continues to occupy Arab lands.

And yet, and yet.... Today we are talking about something far greater which allows the USSR and the United States to really be on the same side of the barricades for the time being. After all, Iraq's aggression against Kuwait was a challenge to the entire system of international relations emerging after the end of the "cold war." That system is still fragile. Not everyone yet believes that the USSR and the United States are really capable of shaking off ideological rivalry and cooperating to establish a new international order in which conditions will be dictated by the force of policy rather than the policy of force and nobody will be able to enjoy the fruits of aggression. That is why the meeting today between the presidents in Helsinki—where, by common consent, the foundations of this new international order will be laid—is so important. In this sense Helsinki is taking up where Malta and Washington left off.

How far do we agree to go along with Washington? Clearly, this question too will be a subject at the Helsinki talks. We advocate a political, peaceful approach. But what if shooting breaks out in the Gulf?

There is a lot of talk in the press at present about our military specialists in Iraq. And stress is being placed on the fact that this problem is more moral than military. Yes, of course. But it is also an economic problem. After all, we are ultimately talking about several billion dollars. Of course, we do not intend to cynically place money and moral problems on a par with each other. But at the same time the question arises: Just how moral is it under these conditions for Washington, say, to be spending billions of dollars supporting the Israeli occupation of the Arab territories—money that could be used for nobler purposes? In short, we can also expect this issue to be resolved here in Helsinki.

Yes, there are many issues. The 2,000 journalists who have descended on the capital over the past few days are expecting that at least the main issue will be answered at this, for many people, unexpected and—it is now clear—highly necessary meeting between the Soviet and U.S. presidents. [passage omitted]

China

Shevardnadze To Meet With Chinese Counterpart

OW0709153990 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0100 GMT 5 Sep 90

[Commentary by Tomilin from the "Current Events and Commentaries" program]

[Text] Observers believe that the meeting of the Soviet and Chinese foreign ministers in Harbin City was an important event and mechanism for the two countries to expand and improve their cooperation. Our international reporter Tomilin has the following comments on this:

Gorbachev's visit to China in May of last year fully normalized the relations between the two countries and gave a poweful impetus to promoting their political, economic, trade, scientific and technological, cultural, and personnel exchanges. It was quite natural that the Soviet and Chinese foreign ministers announced the continuation of joint efforts in the future to implement the long-term cooperation plan adopted at the summit and to develop good-neighborly relations on the basis of the Soviet-Chinese joint communique issued on 18 May 1989.

Now, cooperation between our two neighoring countries has taken on new forms. In addition to traditional trade, work has begun to establish state-operated enterprises and cooperatives with joint investments. Several thousand Chinese are now working in our country, mostly in the building industry and agriculture. The future of Soviet-Chinese cooperation will depend to a great extent on complementary features and aspects of industry and agriculture in the two countries. For instance, the Soviet Union will continue to supply China with ferrous alloys and aluminum to meet the latter's needs in developing its power and aviation industries. Besides food items, the Chinese side will supply the Soviet Union with nonferrous metals, consumer goods, and products of its rapidly developing electronics industry.

Two most important agreements were signed at the fifth meeting of the Council for Economic, Trade, and Scientific and Technological Cooperation Between the Soviet and Chinese Governments held recently in Beijing: the agreement on protection of each other's investments and the agreement on prevention of duplicate taxation. In reality, the intent of these agreements is to mutually provide most favored treatment.

It should be noted that Harbin was the first stop on Shevardnadze's trip to several Far Eastern countries.

Not long ago, Harbin received several hundred visiting public figures from the economic and trade circles, who came there for economic and trade negotiations, involving the Soviet Union and Far Eastern countries. Agreements totaling two billion Swiss francs were signed at that time, and more than 95 percent of the agreements were signed with the Soviet Union.

There is another thing that we should point out in particular: After discussion, Shevardnadze and Qian Qichen agreed that the next round of talks on reducing armed forces along the border and enhancing mutual confidence will begin on 10 September. Both sides expressed determination to strive for progress in this regard through the forthcoming talks.

PRC Seeks Cooperation in Gold Mining

LD1009091890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0313 GMT 10 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Oreshin]

[Text] Beijing, 10 Sep (TASS)—China is expressing readiness to develop and expand cooperation with the Soviet Union in the area of gold mining. A delegation from the PRC Ministry of the Metallurgical Industry, led by Xu Daquan, the vice minister, left Beijing for a visit to the USSR today in order to discuss specific aspects of bilateral cooperation in this sphere.

The Chinese side is interested in purchasing Soviet technology for developing complex gold seams which would make it possible to increase mining productivity and reduce losses. This visit by the Chinese delegation, notes CHINA DAILY, will make it possible to substantially set up Soviet-Chinese cooperation in the area of gold mining which began two years ago.

The USSR and China have also agreed on holding an exhibition of Soviet gold mining technology and equipment this October in Harbin, the administrative center of the northeastern province of Heilongjiang. Specialists from the two countries who will gather for the exhibition will be able to discuss technical details of cooperation, writes the paper.

Commentary Examines Chinese Border Disputes

OW0709115290 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0100 GMT 6 Sep 90

[Commentary by Nikolayev]

[Text] Questions of border disputes between China and its neighboring countries, which have had a serious impact on the situation in Asia, are gradually being tackled. The results of the meeting of the Indian-Chinese Joint Working Group on Boundary Issues held in New Delhi a few days ago have proved that this is true.

According to a report, the main achievement of the meeting is that both sides reached an agreement on establishing a special mechanism for military officers of the two countries to work together to maintain peace and tranquillity in their border areas. As for the border issue itself, it seems that China and India need to make more efforts in seeking a solution acceptable to both sides. But the main thing is that neither Beijing nor New Delhi holds that the border issue is an impediment to the development of Sino-Indian relations as a whole. The mutual understanding in this respect reached in December 1988 during former Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi's Beijing visit still stands. The facts mentioned above have proved that this is true. Both sides have agreed on Chinese Premier Li Peng's visit to India within this year and Indian Foreign Minister Gujral's visit to Beijing in October. The consolidation of good-neighborly relations between the biggest countries in the Asian region and their holding a dialogue to peacefully settle their disputes, doubtless are conducive to improving the political atmosphere on the Asian continent.

It is completely reasonable to believe that the situation regarding Soviet-Chinese relations is similar. When Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze visited Harbin on 1 September, he announced that another round of Soviet-Chinese negotiations to discuss such important things as the reduction of mutual armed forces and strengthening of military thrust on Soviet-Chinese border areas will be held in Moscow.

I think it is appropriate to point out the following: At the end of August China and Laos signed an agreement on setting up joint markers to demarcate the boundary. Under the agreement, measures will be adopted to turn Sino-Lao border areas into peace and cooperation zones. Recently, Li Peng, head of the Chinese Government, announced that China is willing to discuss the question of normalization of relations, including the territorial issue, with Vietnam in the near future. This has given people great hopes.

This prospect is now even more hopeful as a new hope for the settlement of the Cambodian question has arisen. In short, the emerging situation shows that many neighboring countries in Asia have proved with actual deeds that they are loyal to the principle of good-neighborliness.

Northeast Asia

Shevardnadze Holds News Conference in Tokyo

Calls Talks 'Positive'

LD0809111790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1630 GMT 7 Sep 90

[Text] The official visit to Japan by our country's Foreign Minister Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze ended today. Before leaving, by air, the Soviet minister spoke to journalists. Here is part of what he said:

[Begin Shevardnadze recording] At the center of the talks and conversations I had with my colleague, Minister Nakayama, were questions connected with work on a peace treaty, and especially questions connected with preparations for the visit to Japan of the president of the Soviet Union, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. The exchange of views that has been taking place in Tokyo has shown that both we and our Japanese colleagues attach great importance to the present stage of bilateral relations, and feel to the full the insistent need to seek mutually acceptable options for solving the matters that relate to the peace treaty.

In discussing the progress of preparations for the visit to Japan at summit level, Mr. Nakayama and I coordinated a program of joint work and mapped out a number of questions. We spoke in detail of regional problems: Above all, the Gulf crisis. We adopted a joint statement on this. That is a notable fact in itself: I cannot remember our having adopted documents of this kind before. I think this fact—that we are issuing a joint document, a joint statement—reflects the positive processes that are now unfolding throughout the world. We discussed the situation regarding a settlement in Afghanistan, and in Cambodia, and the ways and means of ensuring security and stability in Asia and the Pacific. Our discussion of the Cambodia problem—a Cambodian settlement—was very detailed. I want to say that the Soviet side, too, is willing to establish contacts and conduct a dialogue with Prince Sihanouk.

We discussed in detail, and on the whole, positively, the situation in Asia and the Pacific. In this connection it seems to us that certain circles in various countries are manifesting a certain wariness as soon as we start talking about the Asian and Pacific region. We get the impression that there are people who see behind our every word some self-interested calculation that goes against the interests of the region. This we do not quite understand. No one should look for a false bottom to the Soviet approach to the region's problems. We do indeed have a self-interest: It is that military activity in the Pacific and Indian oceans and the adjacent states should be reduced. With this aim we are willing to act jointly with all states, including, of course, Japan.

I will also mention the Korean problem. Four days ago we were in Pyongyang, and had extensive talks there. Naturally, we informed the Japanese side of the situation in the Korean peninsula, and the stance adopted by, and the efforts of, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to settle the conflict, reunite the nation, and establish political dialogue with the South. Here the Soviet and Japanese sides welcomed the meeting of the heads of government of North and South Korea.

Due attention was given to general East-West relations, including those between the USSR and the United States, and also to the processes that are taking place in Europe: The unification of Germany, the establishment of new relations between NATO and the Warsaw Pact, and the creation of general European institutions and structures of security.

The Japanese side positively assessed our approaches in these areas. Questions of bilateral relations were discussed in a constructive spirit. We declared, for example, our intention of studying seriously the Japanese request for a search on the territory of the Soviet Union for the burial places of former Japanese prisoners of war, and also for details of the total number of those buried and for lists of them. These and other accords were reflected in a joint document: A memorandum on mutual understanding concerning matters related to the visit of the president of the USSR to Japan, which will be published. [end recording]

Discusses Kurils Dispute

PM0909180790 Moscow TRUD in Russian 8 Sep 90 p 3

[Article by TRUD correspondent S. Bunin: "East Not West? On Results of E.A. Shevardnadze's Japan Visit"]

[Excerpt] Tokyo, 7 Sep—[passage omitted] In the interval between official meetings E.A. Shevardnadze found time to talk with a small group of Soviet journalists covering the talks. Here are a few of the questions and answers:

[Question] How does the minister himself assess the results of the consultations?

[Shevardnadze] On the whole the meetings in Tokyo have been very necessary, particularly in the light of the preparations for a major foreign policy event—the visit to Japan by the Soviet president. An agenda has been agreed and documents prepared on eight different avenues of cooperation. This alone would have ensured a considerable program for the visit. But we also raised the question of adopting a more substantial document next spring—in the form of a declaration, or of the basic principles of relations for the immediate future. I am pleased to report that Prime Minister Kaifu reacted positively to this. This will be a very important document which will have a great influence on the current and future state of our relations.

For the first time in our practice the problems of strategic stability and security in Asia have been discussed thoroughly and meaningfully. There was a serious discussion about the two countries' tasks in seeking ways to overcome military confrontation at sea. As a result a broad spectrum of issues emerged for good mutual understanding.

The third category was a fully comprehensive discussion of bilateral relations—as distinct from my previous visits to Japan. This time the Japanese showed greater interest in the development of economic relations.

[Question] How did the discussion of the most complex problem—the "territorial" issue—go?

[Shevardnadze] Despite the generally favorable atmosphere—which was immediately apparent compared with previous talks—there were also, of course, complex issues to discuss. The main issue among them is the problem of a peace treaty, including its territorial aspect. There has still been no progress toward bringing the sides' positions closer together on this issue. Japan considers it a key issue and hopes that the Soviet president's visit will make amendments to our position. Our opinion is different. Admittedly, unlike previous meetings, the Japanese side made no attempt to dramatize our differences. We are also in favor of this.

In order to find common ground on difficult problems we need the appropriate atmosphere. In this connection we advocated the following idea: Why not declare the decade remaining until the end of the 20th century a decade during which we build fundamentally new relations between our two countries? Maybe during this constructive process we will find it easier to find answers to the hardest questions.

[Question] Did we state our attitude toward the attempts to internationalize the disputed "northern territories" issue?

[Shevardnadze] We particularly stressed at the talks that we do not need to internationalize this issue in order to resolve it. The reaction from the Japanese side was healthy and correct. Yes, we agreed that we do not need intermediaries on this. And it is important that everyone is well aware that such a complex issue cannot be resolved in a year.

[Question] Can it be said that the Japanese are now "receptive" to moving forward in other areas—such as a discussion of security matters in the Asia-Pacific region, for instance—in parallel with the resolution of this issue?

[Shevardnadze] My impression is that the Japanese side is prepared to develop relations in other areas as well. As for the idea of collective security, on that the opinion still prevails in Japan that Asia is Asia and European standards do not apply to it. That is probably why our proposal for a meeting of Asian foreign ministers to be held in Vladivostok tentatively in 1993 did not get a particularly enthusiastic reception. I think, however, that this is to overdramatize the specific features of the East and to overemphasize caution.

[Question] The following question is natural: Is it ultimately the case that the Japanese have to all intents and purposes retreated from their former hard-line position (if not in words, then in action) and have adopted our formula for the normalization of relations—the comprehensive building up of cooperation across the board with a view to creating a correspondingly healthy atmosphere for mutual understanding?

E.A. Shevardnadze's reply to this TRUD question was brief: "Let's not emphasize who adopted whose formula."

IZVESTIYA Interviews Shevardnadze on Visit

PM0809203190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Article by S. Agafonov and M. Yusin Tokyo: "Eduard Shevardnadze: Constructive Dialogue Emerging Between USSR and Japan. USSR Foreign Minister Gives Interview to IZVESTIYA and YOMIURI Correspondents at the End of His Japan Visit"]

[Text] [IZVESTIYA] Eduard Amvrosiyevich, the program of your visit is over. What will you say to President Gorbachev when you meet with him on your return to Moscow and he asks about the results of your trip?

[Shevardnadze] I'll tell Gorbachev that the talks were productive and I was very satisfied with their results. One of the main aims of the trip was to prepare for the Soviet president's visit to Japan. We agreed on a date for the visit—next April—and discussed a possible agenda and a list of agreements which could be signed. This list is impressive—it covers all the main avenues of our relations.

The Japanese leaders reacted positively to our proposal to draw up a document on the main principles underlying Soviet-Japanese cooperation, which, as we see it, could cover the next 10-15 years.

It was decided to set up working groups which will tackle specific problems emerging in connection with the preparations for the Gorbachev visit and the elaboration of future agreements. I hope that this mechanism will be effective. We will sum up the first results of our work in Moscow at the end of this year—during the visit by Japanese Foreign Minister Mr. Nakayama.

I will make no secret of the fact that we encountered serious problems when discussing certain issues. At the same time, the talks strengthened my opinion that Japan's leaders are interested in cooperation with the USSR. Both sides recognized that we should no longer mark time. It is impermissible that our bilateral relations remain neglected and are lagging behind the processes taking place in the world. We need to achieve a breakthrough. If this happens, the atmosphere worldwide—and particularly in the Asian-Pacific region—will change for the better.

[IZVESITYA] The USSR and Japan have agreed that Nakayama's visit to Moscow will take place in December. Probably not all issues will have been resolved after the visit and additional meetings will be needed to prepare for the Gorbachev visit. Is it possible that, if necessary, you could travel to Tokyo again before April 1991?

[Shevardnadze] I do not rule out that option. If we are to conclude major agreements with the Japanese then undoubtedly new meetings will be needed—not least at foreign minister level. All the more so as I sense that my

colleague Nakayama and I are establishing a good personal rapport, which will help us to better understand each other.

[IZVESTIYA] Talking about the results of the visit, you said that, despite a generally favorable impression, serious differences emerged over certain issues. Let's leave the "stumbling block" of the territorial dispute to one side for the moment. What other problems exist between Moscow and Tokyo, in what spheres is dialogue being built with difficulty, and where, in your view, have we failed to achieve the progress we were counting on?

[Shevardnadze] Over the past few days we have been trying to organize a dialogue on many problems which in the past had been considered intractable—to the extent that they were not even touched upon during talks. For all intents and purposes we discussed in detail for the first time the military-political aspects of our relations and questions of strategic stability and security in the Asian-Pacific region.

This is an extremely topical subject. But it must be admitted that we failed to reach specific accords and achieve mutual understanding on all issues. I get the impression that the Japanese side is on its guard as soon as talk turns to the Asian-Pacific region. Some people see Soviet initiatives as having some kind of ulterior motive or being based on self-interested calculation that runs counter to Japanese interests. This complicates the dialogue.

I believe that in future at talks on the problems of the Asian-Pacific region we need to take account of the U.S. factor—the building of collaboration with the United States, which has a considerable military presence and political influence in the region. We do not rule out the possibility that the military-political problems of the Asian-Pacific region will be discussed on a trilateral basis (with the participation of the Americans) or on a multilateral basis—with the involvement of representatives of North and South Korea, China, and other interested countries.

In the military sphere we submitted to the Japanese side a list of eight measures aimed at strengthening confidence. No reply has yet been received. And that is not surprising—after all, this is a serious issue and time will be needed to study the Soviet initiatives.

Nor were the Japanese and I unanimous on the Korean issue. We discussed this subject in very great detail. Moscow and Tokyo take a different view of the presence of U.S troops on the Korean peninsula and also of the means of allaying certain countries' concern owing to the lack of an agreement between the DPRK and the International Atomic Energy Authority [IAEA].

Not everything went the way we would have liked during the discussion of the economic aspects of our cooperation. On the one hand, I felt that Japan's leaders are interested in strengthening ties with us. They know about the economic difficulties which the Soviet Union is currently facing, and have stated their desire to help perestroyka. However, it was not possible to achieve real, tangible results. Unfortunately, we did not draw up any specific plans in the economic sphere during the visit.

[IZVESTIYA] There is a widespread view in both Japan and the Soviet Union that our countries are not ready for economic cooperation as yet. They have very few points of contact in the economic sphere, and consequently our ties will remain at their current low level for the foreseeable future. Many people believe that Japan has no interest in us as an economic partner. Do you agree with that assessment?

[Shevardnadze] No, I don't. We have unlimited opportunities to develop our economic cooperation. First, vast regions where Japanese entrepreneurs could profitably invest their efforts and capital are being opened up in the Soviet Union. Second, advantageous conditions for foreign investment are being created in our country. Laws have already been prepared on this score and they will soon be adopted. Foreign businessmen are not yet conversant with their content, but, believe me, as soon as the laws come onto the statute books there will be an enormous desire for cooperation with the USSR in the business world. I am sure that Japan will not be left behind.

At the moment Japan often lags behind other states. Here is a recent example. The USSR has announced the conversion policy, dozens of defense enterprises are being switched to a civil footing and are opening up to economic cooperation. These are mainly the best and most modern plants with a skilled workforce. The West Germans reacted immediately. They rushed to conclude contracts with these enterprises and thereby strengthened their position in the Soviet market—which may prove very beneficial in the future. Yet the Japanese did nothing....

There is still a common opinion that only the Soviet Union is interested in developing economic ties with its neighbor, while out of the entire range of bilateral issues the Japanese are concerned only about the territorial problem. It seems to me that this situtation is changing. In my talks in Tokyo I repeatedly mentioned how the Gulf crisis has affected other countries' economies. What will happen if the conflict escalates still further? How will dozens of countries overcome the energy shortage which will inevitably occur when oil supplies are turned off? I think that the leaders of Japan and other states are coming to the conclusion that, bearing in mind the unstable situation in the Gulf, it is necessary to develop closer relations with the USSR. Several years ago we proposed that the Japanese start jointly developing the very rich oil and gas deposits in our country. At the time, regrettably, we were unable to reach agreement. Perhaps the situation is more favorable now. It seems to me that in the future economic cooperation between the USSR and Japan could be a very interesting sphere of our relations.

[IZVESTIYA] Did you sense any change in the Japanese position on the question of the northern territories? One gets the impression that the Japanese Government has toned down its position somewhat and is being more flexible.

[Shevardnadze] I sensed that serious shifts are occurring and important changes are coming to a head. Until now we had been told that until the territorial issue is settled there can be no question of cooperation with the USSR. I think that people in Japan today are coming to realize that the territorial problem cannot be settled immediately, a peace treaty cannot be signed in the space of a year. You get the impression that the Japanese leadership is prepared to discuss questions of economic cooperation and the potential for Soviet-Japanese collaboration in the international arena in parallel with the problem of the "northern islands" and a peace treaty. The existence of the territorial dispute cannot justify the fact that we are marking time in other areas. This is in the interests of neither the Soviet Union nor Japan.

Commentaries Review Shevardnadze's Japan Visit

Kuril Proposals Forwarded

OW0809095690 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 7 Sep 90

[Commentary by (Orev Hichedorov)]

[Text] The principle objective of Soviet-Japan foreign ministerial talks in Tokyo is to prepare for President Gorbachev's visit to Japan scheduled for next spring. His planned visit to Japan is seen by the Soviet Union and Japan as the best chance for drastically improving their relations.

Improvement in relations has been hampered by Japan's demand for the return of the four Kuril Islands, which came under Soviet jurisdiction at the end of World War II, or the northern territories issue. The Japanese side has set the return of these islands as a precondition for improving relations with the Soviet Union in various areas. However, the Soviet side has proposed invigorating relations between the two countries in various areas and has called for discussion on all issues, including the territories, as part of this plan.

Foreign Minister Shevardnadze went to Tokyo with concrete proposals. For example, he proposed that the leaders of the two countries should state that their nations will no longer take a hostile attitude toward one another. The leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States have already declared this.

Foreign Minister Shevardnadze made a series of proposals for strengthening military trust between the Soviet Union and Japan. A peace treaty, a pending issue since World War II, would be the most important document in Soviet-Japan relations. The Soviet-Japan working-level group on the peace treaty has thus far held five rounds of meetings. Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze and his Japanese counterpart, during their Tokyo talks, agreed to exchange draft treaties during the sixth round of meetings.

According to TASS reports from Tokyo, Foreign Minister Shevardnadze addressed Japanese citizens at the Teikoku Hotel in Tokyo on 6 September. In his address, he said: President Gorbachev's planned visit to Japan will be a turning point in the history of the two countries. We came to Japan to discuss with Japanese leaders ways to improve relations between two countries through joint efforts. This is the principle objective of our visit to Japan. In principle, the state of war between our two countries has ended, and relations have been restored. In general, relations have made substantial progress. However, the lack of a peace treaty, the conclusion of which would signal a departure from the past, has slowed improving relations between the two countries. Today, life is drastically changed; what has hitherto been viewed as impossible becomes possible. It has become possible for us to resolve issues which we previously regarded as impossible to resolve.

A year ago, German unification was no more than a utopia. However, I expect that the six-nation foreign ministerial talks coming up next week in Moscow will be able to close the chapter on World War II in Europe.

I think that it is time to expect the same thing to take place in the Orient. Relations between our countries have never been stalemated. Previous talks between our countries reveal that ambiguous proposals made frequently by the Soviet Union and Japan failed to solve problems. We are fully aware of Japan's attitude on separating politics from economics. If the Soviet Union took the same attitude as Japan, there would be no political or economic cooperation between our countries. What is at issue is reciprocal economic cooperation. Needless to say, it is possible to exclude this. If reciprocal economic cooperation is excluded from relations between our countries, this will separate politics from economics; this runs counter to good sense. The Soviet Union thinks it far more desirable that politics develop economics and economics give impetus to politics. Is it not time for our countries to push vigorously for the development of economic and trade exchanges through joint efforts?

These were Foreign Minister Shevardnadze's remarks.

'Optimistic View' of Relations

OW0809151890 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 6 Sep 90

[Commentary by Radio Moscow commentator Andreyev]

[Text] Of late, Soviet and Japanese foreign ministers have not reached a consensus on serious problems connected with international crises very frequently. Or rather, the two sides have stated their own views to each other, but they have always failed to reach an accord.

However, a joint statement denouncing the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait as a grave danger to international peace and security was issued at the Tokyo talks. Thus, the talks can be appraised as an event that will open up good prospects for future relations between the Soviet Union and Japan.

In the joint statement, the two nations declared their common view that the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait was an illegal act in violation of the UN Charter. The two nations demanded the immediate withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait and swift restoration of its sovereignty, independence, and territories. It is also significant that the Soviet Union and Japan have reached an accord on the following solutions to the Persian Gulf crisis:

At present, favorable changes are taking place in relations between East and West, and these conditions are useful in seeking ways to form a new international order. In this connection, collective efforts of various nations in settling the Persian Gulf crisis may serve as a proof that the international community is capable of guaranteeing peace and stability in the future.

The two foreign ministers called on all nations to take joint actions in observing UN Security Council resolutions on the Persian Gulf dispute. They also touched on the hostage issue involving the detention of foreign nationals in Kuwait and Iraq in violation of human rights and international law. The Soviet Union and Japan also have reached the consensus that Iraq should immediately release and return these foreign nationals to their home countries safely by observing the UN Security Council resolutions. Moreover, the two foreign ministers urged Iraq to remove impediments to diplomatic missions and refrain from any actions violating their diplomatic immunity.

Thus, the Soviet-Japanese foreign ministerial talks started smoothly on Wednesday morning, and this fact had a favorable influence on the talks covering various issues concerning the Asian-Pacific region that were held Wednesday afternoon. Concerning these issues, the two foreign ministers stated that the favorable process taking place in Europe should also be popularized in the Asian-Pacific region. As expected, Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze made concrete proposals that can serve as a strong basis for bilateral cooperation in maintaining peace and security in the Asian-Pacific region.

Included in the 10 major points of the proposals are mutual study of military doctrines of the two nations, mutual notification about large-scale exercises, provision of timely information concerning closure of certain maritime areas during periods when practice firing is being conducted, and invitation of observers to exercises and maneuvers. In addition, the proposals include establishment of contacts and exchanges between the Soviet Defense Ministry and the Japanese Defense Agency; exchanges of visits by ground, naval, and air forces; and the drawing up and conclusion of a Soviet-Japanese agreement on preventing incidents at sea.

For his part, Japanese Foreign Minister Nakayama noted the growing role played by the Asian-Pacific region in today's world, and stated his view that maintaining stability in this region would promote broad economic cooperation between the nations located in the region.

The current Shevardnadze-Nakayama talks held in Tokyo have been of great use, and we can say that the talks have provided good reason to have an optimistic view concerning future relations between the two nations. With President Gorbachev's visit to Japan scheduled for next year, we can have great expectations concerning the development of relations between our two nations. The current Tokyo talks have certainly been of great significance in connection with Gorbachev's scheduled visit to Japan.

Comparison of Soviet-Japanese Statement on Iraq

PM0709114890

Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian on 7 September 1990 carries in its Morning Edition on page 4 the Soviet and Japanese foreign ministers' statement on Iraq. This item has been compared with the Moscow TASS International Service in Russian version published under the headline "Issues Joint Statement on Iraq" in the 5 September Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page 29, revealing the following variation:

Page 5, column one, fourth complete paragraph, only sentence in IZVESTIYA reads: ...witness to the ability of the international.... (substituting "ability" for "stability")

PRAVDA Editor Receives Japanese Lawmakers

PM0709101490 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Sep 90 Second Edition p 4

[Unattributed report: "Meeting at the Editorial Office"]

[Text] I.T. Frolov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chief editor of PRAVDA, has received T. Ueda [as transliterated], chairman of the Japanese parliament House of Representatives special commission on questions of Okinawa and the North, who had come to the Soviet Union as head of a group of parliamentarians. A conversation took place on topical questions of Soviet-Japanese relations.

Reportage Continues on North-South Korean Ties

'A Long Way' to Unity

PM0709112990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Article by V. Ganshin: "Premiers' Difficult Dialogue"]

[Text] In Europe the new day was only just beginning when the prime ministers of North and South Korea shook hands and got down to talks in Seoul's Intercontinental Hotel.

So far little is known of the specific details of the meeting. That is why I would merely cite those reports which the editorial office has so far received by telex from correspondents accredited in Seoul.

REUTERS reports, for instance, that at the first meeting with his North Korean colleague the South Korean premier proposed discussing draft "foundations for agreement," comprising eight points. Thus, Kang Yong-hun pointed to the need to permit free movement across the border during major common national holidays as the first step toward unification. In the premier's opinion, the North and South should cut their troop numbers, promote economic cooperation, and help to reunite families divided by the Korean War. "The most acute and important question for both parts of Korea," Kang Yong-hun said, "is to improve relations based on the spirit of recognition and respect for the other side's social system."

Among the proposals concerning military issues, the South Korean premier expressed the thought that it is necessary to cut the Armed Forces of North and South to equal levels. As a first step along this road Pyongyang, in South Korea's opinion, should cut its army from 870,000 to 650,000—that is, to the level of the South Korean Army. Admittedly, Kang Yong-hun failed to mention the more than 40,000-strong U.S. Army deployed in South Korea. Yet, as is well known, the withdrawal of U.S. troops from the south of the peninsula along with their stockpiles of nuclear weapons is one of Pyongyang's main demands at the talks.

It seems that the military aspect will be the most difficult to resolve during the dialogue that has begun. There is no doubt that the northerners are hardly likely to want to give up their fundamental positions. But the southerners too are not slow to defend some basic positions either. I would suggest that this is perhaps not so much the southerners' position as it is that of the Americans who stand behind them.

Thus, UPI's Washington correspondent, citing a State Department staffer who wished to remain anonymous, quotes him as saying that, despite the unprecedented talks between North and South and despite the U.S. military buildup in the Persian Gulf, the White House intends to keep its troops in the south of the Korean Peninsula "for as long as the threat from the North exists." In his words, there is still a high level of tension between the two sides and there is still a long way to go before unification....

Barely three hours into the talks radical South Korean students marched through the streets of Seoul to the place where the two prime ministers were meeting. They accused the government of "wanting to exploit the fact that the talks are taking place to strengthen the fascist regime." There were clashes with the police. Eyewitnesses note that seven students were arrested.

Single UN Entry Discussed

SK0809060990 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 1 Sep 90

[Report on interview with Kim Hui-su, DPRK charge d'affaires ad interim to the USSR, by unidentified station reporters on 31 August in Moscow—read by announcer]

[Text] The DPRK Embassy in the Soviet Union gave a news conference to Soviet reporters yesterday. Kim Hui-su, the DPRK's charge d'affaires ad interim to the Soviet Union, spoke there. Our station reporter will report from the Embassy.

[Reporter] Kim Hui-su explained the North-South Korean premiers' talks, which will be held in Seoul from 4-7 September, and the DPRK's proposal that North and South Korea enter the United Nations as a single member.

[Kim Hui-su] We are looking forward to the North and South Korean premiers' talks with great hope. The issue of Korea's entry into the United Nations will be one of the important issues to be discussed at the talks. As is known, the DPRK advanced a proposal on this issue, that is, for North and South Korea to have a single seat. We consider this as a good way to remove confrontation and to promote the atmosphere of trust and national unity on the Korean peninsula. If the two sides separately enter the United Nations or if one of the two sides unilaterally enters it, this will create a new obstacle to dialogue.

Our proposal will lead to compromise, and South Korea's stand was also considered in our proposal. We think that the two sides will alternately enjoy a power of representation. The two sides will be able to exercise the right to speak only on issues that they agree on.

Even though the South side agreed to discuss this proposal in the premiers' talks, in reality, it has positively carried out activities to independently enter the United Nations. A special envoy of the South Korean president has visited several West European countries in an effort to win support in advance for their UN efforts. This is an open challenge to the Korean people's proposal and a breach of the agreement.

[Reporter] If South Korea does not accept the proposal for a single UN entry, how will the DPRK respond?

[Kim Hui-su] We think that South Korea's application must be discussed at a UN Security Council [UNSC] meeting. When South Korea previously tried to independently enter the United Nations, the Soviet Union and China, which are permanent UNSC members, vetoed this bid. We believe that if the South Korean representative again creates a confrontational circumstance, both the Soviet Union and China will again support us. I

know that the Chinese representative will express his own opinion. We also believe in the Soviet Union.

[Reporter] It is expected that the North-South Korean premiers' talks will discuss the issue of alleviating military tension on the Korean Peninsula. Can any concrete achievements be brought about during the dialogue [words indistinct]?

[Kim Hui-su] This will be a basic issue in the talks. The two sides agreed to include the chiefs of staff of the Armed Forces of the North and South in each side's delegation. They will deal with this issue. The issue of taking measures to reduce the two sides' Armed Forces, the issue of ending propaganda offensives against each other, and the issue of ending propaganda efforts along the Demarcation Line will be discussed. The issue of entering the United Nations will, of course, be a priority issue.

'Mistrust' Still Plays Role

SK1009021390 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 4 Sep 90

[Text] PRAVDA correspondent (Vladimir Peretsada) recently has been to the ROK. The following is his report on the situation on the Korean peninsula and the direction of its adjustment.

The 38th parallel is the borderline reminding us of the cold war. Moreover, it is what continues to remain very dangerous. With the demolition of the Berlin wall, it is now the only barrier on the globe. The barrier not only divides a homogeneous nation, but it also maintains the severe confrontation—which already has been removed in Europe—between two social systems on a part of Asia.

In Panmunjom on the demarcation line which divides Korea into the North and South, multisided dialogue long has continued between the two sides in Korea. Military representatives, assemblymen, Red Cross men, and social representatives have met with one another many times. However, such contacts had been used as an opportunity to mutually slander and smear or to persist in each side's assertions on procedural matters.

Then, about a month ago, on 26 July, an agreement was signed there. The significance of this agreement is great. I would like to remind that it has taken a full 18 years to agree on holding governmental-level military and political talks. Direct dialogue always has been put aside.

Then, at long last, is the cold war ending on the Korean peninsula as well? Regrettably, it would not be easy to end the cold war there. Mistrust which has accumulated for many years still eclipses mutual understanding. For instance, the effort aimed at mutually opening the borderline on the occasion of the 45th anniversary of the Korean liberation from the Japanese rule has been fruitless.

This being the situation, isn't anything going to mar the future of the premiers' talks? We would like to believe that nothing would. Our belief is based on the fact that the external conditions are now very favorable for easing confrontation on the Korean peninsula. We also believe so, because the external conditions have been created through Soviet policy on the current issues.

ROK publications carry articles on this; state and political activists say the same thing. This sort of particular assessment, I have heard in Seoul, is the result of the Gorbachev-No Tae-u meeting held in San Francisco last June. The KOREA TIMES even described the meeting as revolutionary.

South of the 38th Parallel, the San Francisco meeting has been viewed as a sign to recognize the ROK as a sovereign state. The meeting has been regarded also as a step to ease military confrontation in the Asian and Pacific region. The prospects for which have become even (?brighter) following the Soviet-U.S. foreign ministers talks in Irkutsk. At the Irkutsk talks, the two countries have agreed not to remain as military powers in Asia.

According to what I have learned at the meeting held at the chief executive's office in Seoul, the ROK leadership is willing to hold talks with the participation of Moscow, Washington, Beijing, Tokyo, and Pyongyang to ease tension and to build confidence in the region.

When the world was divided into the two blocs during the cold war, we were in the bloc led by the United States, said Yi Hong-ku, senior presidential assistant for political affairs.

He said: However, who are our neighbors? They are the DPRK, China, and the Soviet Union. Can we continue to survive without establishing reciprocal relations with these neighbors? And, without relations with them, can regional security be guaranteed? Today, thanks to President Gorbachev, possibility has been raised toward this end. We hope that the Gorbachev line will be maintained. If Moscow completely normalizes its relations with us, I think this will further enhance the atmosphere of detente in the Far East.

According to what the ROK Foreign Ministry has told me, the establishment of diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union is on the top of Seoul's foreign policy list.

In our country, I think this issue is not on the bottom of the list either.

However, the issue should be settled in a cautious manner so that current relations with the DPRK won't be damaged. This is naturally not easy. Still, settlement of the issue cannot be postponed indefinitely.

It is clear in principle that the normalization of Seoul-Moscow relations would mean a (?culmination) of Soviet foreign policy, and the DPRK, too, would benefit from this.

The situation on the Korean peninsula, needless to say, largely will depend on Seoul-Pyongyang relations.

To us, still, the North Korean side's policy and proposals have been made known better.

Then, what is the South Korean side's position?

I discussed this question with (Son O-sun), director of the Information Division of the ROK Foreign Ministry.

He said: As is known, Pyongyang does not recognize the ROK. Excuses are that the ROK is the U.S. puppet and an area militarily occupied by the United States. However, we are an independent state which maintains diplomatic relations with 140 countries. (?In talking about reunification), we, first of all, think of normalization and improvement of our relations with North Korea. Generally speaking, our stand can be explained as follows. First of all, the existence of the northern and southern countries on the Korean peninsula must be recognized. Then, the next step should be Soviet and Chinese recognition of South Korea and U.S. and Japanese recognition of North Korea. After this, with the DPRK, we should simultaneously acquire the UN membership. Pyongyang's assertion is that this would perpetuate the division of the nation. Then, what about the cases of the two German states and two Yemeni states?

When I asked what he could say about the U.S. forces, he said: Considering the mellowing climate in the Far East, the United States already has worked out the plan to withdraw 7,000 of its troops. If mutual recognition is realized and if simultaneous UN memberships are acquired, then the presence of the U.S. forces will become unnecessary.

We can see that there is still a long distance between the stand of the North and that of the South. We can even see that their stands are diametrically opposed.

Then, isn't a window for mutual understanding necessary? Absolutely, yes. Only through dialogue, can mutually acceptable conditions be found and confrontation removed.

Near East & South Asia

Secretary Baker Meets With Middle East Leaders

Confers With Saudi King

LD0709202190 Moscow TASS in English 2003 GMT 7 Sep 90

[Text] Cairo September 7 TASS—The king of Saudi Arabia has stated that his country agrees to take upon itself part of the expenditures on the upkeep of U.S. troops in the Gulf area, U.S. Secretary of State James Baker has reported. He answered questions of journalists after the end of talks in Saudi Arabia with King Fahd, Foreign Minister Prince Sa'ud al-Faysal and Defence and Aviation Minister Prince Sultan Bin 'Abd-al-'Aziz.

Baker pointed out that the decision of the Saudi leadership was highly appreciated by the United States which regards it as evidence of excellent relations between the two countries. He did not mention the exact sum that Saudi Arabia agreed to compensate.

Baker said that only a corresponding U.N. commission has the right to decide whether or not to render humanitarian assistance to the Iraqi people in an exceptional case. The assistance should be rendered in the form chosen by the commission, he added. All other actions aimed at rendering so-called "humanitarian assistance" are regarded as the violation of the economic blockade and resolutions of the U.N. Security Council. Baker reiterated U.S. allegiance to U.N. resolutions and expressed hope that all countries would show a responsible attitude to it, even if it is a heavy burden to them.

He described talks in Jeddah as useful and fruitful.

Meets With Mubarak in Cairo

PM0909214390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Report by correspondent D. Velikiy: "Egypt's Firm Position"]

[Text] Cairo—U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker has met with Egyptian President H. Mubarak at the concluding stage of his latest Near East tour. It is being noted that these are Baker's final top-level talks before the Soviet and U.S. presidents' meetings in Helsinki, where the U.S. secretary of state headed directly from Egypt.

Anticipating his visit to Egypt, Baker noted that the coincidence of views between the United States and Saudi Arabia—where he had been the day before—reflects the uncompromising position with regard to Iraq's occupation of Kuwait. The secretary of state added that the United States does not rule out the adoption, for its part, of any actions which could force Iraqi troops to leave Kuwait.

It is reported that among the issues prepared for discussion between Baker and Mubarak is a clarification of the sides' positions regarding the crisis situation in the Gulf, and the problem of economic support for Egypt, which has suffered considerable financial losses as a result of the crisis and its unswerving fulfillment of the sanctions imposed on Iraq.

At the end of the meeting President Mubarak stated that Egypt is prepared to give all possible help to Saudi Arabia to protect that state from the threat of Iraqi aggression. Yet another troop contingent will soon join the Egyptian Armed Forces in Saudi Arabia, the Egyptian president said.

With regard to the Helsinki meeting Mubarak expressed the hope that the Soviet and U.S. presidents will work out a single line of conduct in the conflict that has emerged in the Gulf. Differences of opinion between them could lead to the emergence of even more serious problems.

For his part, Baker stated that he and President Mubarak had discussed the security measures which need to be taken in connection with the situation in the Near East.

The secretary of state's visit to Egypt at this critical time for the Gulf situation and the attention to Egypt's position and policy are no accident, the newspaper AL-JUMHURIYAH writes, since our country has now become pivotal in the Arab world.

Indeed, we cannot fail to agree that Egypt is now the focus of the ideas and efforts of those Arab states—and they are in the majority—which, like it, oppose Iraq's invasion of Kuwait and advocate the unconditional and immediate withdrawal of the occupying forces, the restoration of Kuwait's legitimate government, and the subsequent holding of multilateral talks under Arab League auspices.

Iraq's Saddam Issues Warning to Gorbachev, Bush

LD0909085890 Moscow TASS in English 0822 GMT 9 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Andrey Malyarov]

[Text] Cairo September 9 TASS—Any attempt to change the course of events and to return everything by force to what was before August 2 is doomed, Iraqi President Saddam Husayn said.

He addressed Presidents George Bush and Mikhail Gorbachev on Iraqi television on Saturday evening on the eve of their Helsinki meeting.

The MENA news agency notes, that in his TV address, Saddam lashed out at the United Nations, accusing it of applying the strictest and most unjust sanctions during its entire history.

The Soviet and American presidents were also addressed by the Kuwaiti Amir, Shaykh Jabir al-Ahmad al-Jabir al-Sabah. He expressed hope that the Soviet-American summit would help restore legality and order in Kuwait and punish the aggressor.

The U.S. Administration decided to immediately allocate $10 million for urgent aid to Iraqi and Kuwaiti refugees in Jordan.

Many dozen thousands of people who gathered in Jordan's desert areas, do not have often food, medicines and even water.

According to reports from Kuwait City, Iraqi troops destroyed several mosques in Kuwait with artillery fire on Saturday. The KUNA news agency reports that occupation troops began roundups of Kuwaiti families.

All the arrested are being herded to a hastily built concentration camp in Kuwait.

Kuwaiti Amir Appeals to Superpower Leaders

LD0809203690 Moscow TASS in English 2018 GMT 8 Sep 90

[Text] Cairo September 8 TASS—The Kuwaiti people expect the Soviet-American summit to denounce the Iraqi invasion and take appropriate measures for punishing the aggressor, says an appeal of the Kuwaiti Amir Shaykh Jabir al-Ahmad al-Jabir al-Sabah to Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and U.S. President George Bush.

In separate messages sent to the Soviet and American leaders ahead of the Helsinki summit the amir urged them to exert maximum efforts for ensuring the observance of the U.N. sanctions against Iraq and of all Security Council resolutions without exception.

In the message sent to Bush the amir praised the stand assumed by the U.S. leadership with regard to the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait and the efforts, exerted by the U.S. Administration for restoring law and order in Kuwait.

In the message sent to the Soviet leader the amir expressed hope on behalf of the Kuwaiti people that the Soviet-American summit would restore the trampled legality and would make it incumbent upon Iraq to observe standards of international law, under which Saddam Husayn must withdraw Iraqi troops from Kuwait.

TASS Notes Kuwaiti Gratitude for Gulf Stand

LD1009084790 Moscow TASS in English 0835 GMT 10 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Viktor Lebedev]

[Text] Abu Dhabi September 10 TASS—"The Soviet Union has assumed a position of principle, a morally correct, humane, just and courageous stand by condemning Iraq's occupation of Kuwait, demanding the withdrawal of Iraqi troops from its territory and the restoration of law and order in the country," Kuwait Prime Minister Shaykh Sa'd al-'Abdallah al-Salim al-Sabah said in an interview to the KUNA news agency in Paris, which was transmitted by the United Emirates' WAM agency.

The Kuwaiti prime minister, who is now in France, expressed gratitude to the USSR and the United States on behalf of the people, government and the amir of Kuwait for upholding the law and justice, condemning aggression and backing the victim of aggression. He stressed that interaction between the two great powers contributed to the strengthening of world stability and security, as well as mankind's progress despite intrigues by the Iraqi president, who wishes to return the world, now living in concord and cooperation, to the cold war and confrontation.

Egypt Expresses 'Indignation' at Saddam's Call

PM0709222790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Article by IZVESTIYA correspondent D. Velikiy: "Outburst of Indignation"]

[Text] Cairo—Saddam Husayn's latest statement, calling on Muslims to oust the leaders of Saudi Arabia and Egypt (who oppose the Iraqi leadership's policy), has provoked indignation in Egypt.

Your correspondent met with Nabil Zaki [name as transliterated], deputy chief editor of the Egyptian newspaper AL-AKHBAR, and asked him to comment on the aforementioned statement.

Above all, the Egyptian journalist said that Saddam Husayn is not the first person to attempt to use the Muslim religion to satisfy his own personal ambitions and to cast his opponents in an anti-Islamic light. Yet there is no doubt that his actions have nothing to do with Islamic teaching.

Egyptians at any rate condemn his invasion of Kuwait. And the country's president—Husni Mubarak—has expressed those sentiments, thereby winning greater support among the people.

As for the overall situation in the Gulf, in Nabil Zaki's opinion the Iraqi leader has said nothing new and did not propose changing the situation for the better. The specter of war continues to stalk the region, and that is why the world is working on positive initiatives. Arabs expect such initiatives from Saddam Husayn, since—as my interlocutor stressed—the idea of a possible outbreak of hostilities in the region is very unpopular among them.

Shevardnadze Ready 'To Try To Resolve' Crisis

TA0809113290 Jerusalem Domestic Service in English 1100 GMT 8 Sep 90

[Text] In the Gulf, a new development overnight. Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze says he is ready to go to Baghdad to try to resolve the crisis. Shevardnadze proposes an international conference to deal not only with the Gulf, but also the Arab-Israeli dispute and the war in Lebanon.

In Jerusalem this morning, Avi Pazner, Prime Minister Shamir's media adviser, in effect rejects the Soviet proposal for the conference. Pazner says it is a mistake to link the various problems in the Middle East. He says the Gulf crisis results from Iraqi aggression and the dangers to peace are derived from it. In Pazner's view, the Gulf crisis, dangerous as it is, should be handled without involving other elements and conflicts.

Tunisia's 'Special Envoy' Zouari Visits Moscow

Received by Belousov 7 Sep

LD0709141190 Moscow TASS in English 1236 GMT 7 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow September 7 TASS—Soviet Deputy Prime Minister Igor Belousov today met special envoy from the Tunisian president Abderahim Zouari who conveyed a personal message from Zine al-Abidine Ben Ali to Mikhail Gorbachev.

Belousov said the Soviet Union is gravely concerned over the current situation in the Gulf and favours the earliest possible settlement of the crisis by political and diplomatic means.

Relevant resolutions by the U.N. Security Council have laid down the basis for such settlement.

In order to elaborate a mutually acceptable formula for unblocking the conflict, the USSR backs active contacts with a wide range of states, including Arab countries.

Zouari informed Belousov about the Tunisian leaders' efforts to work out a pan-Arab platform for settling conflict. He details relevant proposals advanced by the Tunisian president.

Having expressed similar assessments of the Gulf situation, the sides confirmed their readiness to continue contacts on the issues that were raised.

Meets With Shevardnardze 8 Sep

LD0809144390 Moscow TASS in English 1434 GMT 8 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow September 8 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze today met special envoy of the Tunisian president and minister of state A. Zouari.

Shevardnadze said that the Soviet Union was seriously concerned about the present situation in the Persian Gulf and called for an early settlement of the crisis by political and diplomatic methods.

He said the basis for this settlement was laid down by the respective U.N. Security Council resolutions. He emphasised that the USSR maintained vigorous contacts with a wide range of states, including Arab countries, in the interests of elaborating a mutually acceptable formula for defusing the conflict.

Zouari told about the Tunisian leadership's activity to harmonise an all-Arab platform for settling the conflict situation in that region.

The sides presented similar assessments of the situation in the Gulf and expressed readiness to carry on contacts on the issues discussed.

Belonogov Meets With Ambassadors, Reviews Gulf

Meets Indian, Italian Envoys

PM0709104790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Ambassadors Received"]

[Text] A.M. Belonogov, USSR deputy foreign minister, received A.S. Gonsalves, Indian ambassador to the USSR, and F. Salleo, Italian ambassador to the USSR, 4 September. Questions connected with the development of the Gulf crisis were discussed.

Receives Matlock 7 Sep

LD0709101990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0957 GMT 7 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow, 7 Sep (TASS)—USSR Deputy Foreign Minister Aleksandr Belonogov received Jack Matlock, U.S. ambassador in the USSR, at his request today. Issues of the developing situation in the Persian Gulf were discussed.

Meets With UK's Braithwaite

PM0909213790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "British Ambassador Received"]

[Text] A.M. Belonogov, USSR deputy foreign minister, received R. Braithwaite, British ambassador to the USSR, at his request 7 September. Questions connected with the situation in the Persian Gulf were discussed.

Receives Libya's Farjani

PM0909212390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 3

[TASS report under the general headline: "Meetings at USSR Foreign Ministry"]

[Text] A.M. Belonogov, USSR deputy foreign minister, received J. Farjani, special representative of the Libyan leadership, 7 September.

The talks, which were held in a spirit of amicability and mutual understanding, discussed the acute crisis that has emerged in the Persian Gulf as a result of Iraq's aggression against Kuwait. The Soviet side stressed that it is in the Arab states' interests to find political solutions which would make it possible to stop the crisis escalating, to start to defuse it, and to ensure fulfillment of the Security Council demands—the accumulated will of the world community. The representative of the Libyan leadership put forward Libya's view of the crisis in the Gulf and ways of solving it in the context of the initiative made by M. al-Qadhdhafi, leader of the Libyan revolution.

The sides noted the similarity of the views of the USSR and Libya on many aspects of the tense situation in the Gulf.

Confers With Iranian Envoy

LD0809090990 Tehran IRNA in English 0805 GMT 8 Sep 90

[Text] Tehran, Sept. 8, IRNA—The outgoing Iranian ambassador to Moscow Nasir Heirani-Nobari and Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Aleksandr Belonogov Friday discussed current crisis in the Persian Gulf region and ways to harness the tension.

The Iranian diplomat was the guest of honour at a luncheon given by the Soviet official.

Belonogov pointed to positive developments in Moscow-Tehran ties and lauded Nobari's efforts in this respect. He also termed President Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani's 1988 visit to Moscow, took place during Nobari's tenure, as a 'Turning point' in bilateral relations.

Meanwhile Nobari said that during his mission his efforts had constantly been focused on the expansion and upgrading of good neighbourly relations between the two states. He added that his efforts were also based on mutual respect, and non-interference in each other's internal affairs.

Gerasimov Calls for 'Collective Actions' in Gulf

90UF01513A Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian No 35, 1 Sep 90 p 12

[Article by Gennadiy Gerasimov: "Use a Cool Head"]

[Text] A TV picture now not only reflects events but also participates in them as it affects public opinion which, in its turn, is taken into account by the decision-making politicians.

And what looks good on the screen is the aircraft carriers breaking through the waves, fighters screaming up into the air, tanks aiming their guns, and dashing, camouflage-ornamented servicemen. All of them look a lot better than boring diplomats wearing ties and trying to look optimistic.

The press tries to follow suit as they seek to make their materials more sensational: "There Is a Smell of Gunpowder in the Air" was a headline in the 28 August edition of PRAVDA as the tension started to diminish.

This does not mean that the situation in the Persian Gulf is not electrified—it is. But for the TV to lean towards the spectacular is to shove aside the main thing—the diplomatic effort aimed at a peaceful solution of the conflict.

It is primarily the resolution of the UN Security Council demanding that Iraq withdraw from Kuwait and free the foreigners they detain there. It is the effort of the UN Secretary General, it is the effort of our diplomacy maintaining a dialogue with all countries, including Iraq. Among other things we support activating the so-called Arab factor: Are not the Arabs the best people to set their own house in order?

The United States is quite active also but in a different way, however; they keep sending considerable military forces to the region. But the United States can act only "in a coalition with the world community," reminds Zbigniew Brzezinski in the 27 August issue of NEWSWEEK. The former national security adviser to the president reminds us that anti-American feelings have traditionally been very strong in Arab countries and that "if the United States forces its hand there will be a real danger of the confrontation growing into a larger Arab-American conflict."

Henry Kissinger holds to a somewhat different view of the subject in his article in the 19 August THE WASHINGTON POST. He agrees that the United States has to consider "the threat that a more aggressive course could destroy part of the current international support." But at the same time the former secretary of state thinks that the United States "can lose badly in the case of a prolonged blockade," which seems to be more and more likely. Another part of his advice is to consider the possibility of "surgical" strikes aimed at destroying "Iraqi military assets" in case diplomacy fails.

It goes without saying that a blockade is boring from the TV point of view: Nothing changes from day to day. According to Kissinger, time is not on America's side. People will get tired of the subject and other stories will come up.

But this is not a reason to start using force—the "surgical" strikes can easily transform a scalpel into a stick and the stick into a boomerang.

It is rather the reason to enhance collective actions.

The UN Charter contains Chapter 7 (Actions Regarding a Threat to Peace, Violation of Peace, and Acts of Aggression) and that chapter has Article 47 on the creation and the authority of a Military Staff Committee. It outlines also the deployment of troops which the committee would have at its disposal. The article remains on paper, but now that the five permanent members of the Security Council have stopped arguing and started working together it is the time to put it into practice.

Reasons for Arab Support of Saddam Explored

PM1009082690 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Article by A. Ostalskiy: "Those Who Applaud Saddam Husayn"]

[Text] Until quite recently the word "Kuwait" was almost always used in the Iraqi press with the adjective "fraternal." Now, however, President Saddam states that no state of that name exists at all.

True, the reasons for Iraqi behavior, albeit immoral, are understandable. But what is it that motivates that far from small number of people throughout the Arab world—from the Maghreb to the Yemen—who support and welcome the Iraqi blitzkrieg with unfeigned enthusiasm?

Public opinion polls conducted in Jerusalem show that more than 80 percent of Palestinians approve of Saddam Husayn's actions. It seems that virtually the majority of the population in other Arab countries also side with him.

"That's your Palestinians for you, that's your Arabs, that is what their commitment to peace and justice which you tried to persuade us of is worth!"—that is what the friends and allies of the Arabs now hear. And although such assessments are, in my view, inappropriate, it is not so easy to refute them—at least it is far more difficult than it was a month ago, before the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait.

The Arab world's reaction seems to me irrational, dictated by uncontrolled emotions, the result of a kind of mass depression felt by people who are in despair and have lost their last hope. What logic, for example, can explain the Palestinians' positive reaction to Iraq's plans to mount a "counterstrike" with chemical weapons on Israel: Have they really forgotten that more of the Arabs themselves than Jews could die from such an attack? Or another example of the strange "logic" of the Palestinians: By supporting Iraq against the rich oil-producing states of the Persian Gulf they have decided precisely to undermine their own position, because it is from precisely those countries that they have received the bulk of the financial aid which has eased their existence and ensured the functioning of PLO structures. Many hundreds of thousands of Palestinians have found refuge (and very comfortable refuge) in Kuwait and Saudi Arabia, and new such benefactors cannot be found.

Palestinans do not harm just themselves by recklessly supporting Iraqi political pugilism, since the Arabs run the risk of losing the sympathy and support of world public opinion. Who is going to show solidarity with bannrs inscribed solely with blind hatred and spite? But there are quite a few people in the Arab world who have agreed, as it were, to ignore this. And this strange mental aberration cannot be explained solely by instinctive anti-Americanism. It is a striking thing that in many instances those very "integralists" and "fundamentalists" who, it seems, until quite recently considered Saddam Husayn to be their most evil enemy and prayed for Khomeyni's victory now sing the praises of the latter-day idol of Baghdad. Lebanese Shi'ites from the pro-Iranian Hizballah note with amazement that even the manner of speaking and rhetorical devices of the Iraqi ruler have suddenly become reminiscent of the deceased Iranian imam. And words like "jihad" (holy struggle) have suddenly appeared in the Iraqi president's vocabulary—who could have expected this from the Ba'th leader.

But what can the new might of the totalitarian Baghdad regime give the Arabs—what kind of freedom or happiness? Let them ask the Kurds, Egyptian workers, or the Iraqis themselves whether they have an easy time under his rule. "The Kuwaitis have been under occupation for only one month, while we have experienced it for 20 years now," subjects of Saddam Husayn who fled his "paternal endearments" joke wryly. And some people in the Arab world vainly think that victory for Baghdad (of which the seizure of defenseless Kuwait, one has to think, is intended as merely the first step) will restore the honor and dignity of the Arab nation. I am connvinced that time will show that in reality the honor of the Arab nation has been saved in recent weeks not by Saddam Husayn but by Egyptian President Husni Mubarak, who has condemned the annexation of Kuwait more resolutely than the other Arab leaders and has persistently urged the Arabs to reject the "law of the jungle" and restore justice.

And recent events suggest yet another conclusion: If the Near East had not been in a state of such deep and incurable crisis for many decades now, Iraqi aggression might not have occurred and support for it from the Arabs would have been all the more inconceivable. Only out of utter desperation and despair was it possible to applaud the users of force and occupiers. If even a little progress had been made toward a Near East settlement in recent times, if even the smallest steps had been taken toward an Arab-Israeli compromise, if just a little more trust had been shown in the attitudes of the sides.... If, if, if.... What could be more depressing and desperate than the subjunctive mood!

Will the Arabs be able to rise above their emotions and the dark frenzy inciting them to senseless violence? Of course far from everyone applauds Saddam Huseyn. And yet many regard him now, contrary to logic and commonsense, as a national hero. But that is precisely why it is all the more important to stop the false prophet in time and prevent the aggressor triumphing. Otherwise it is not only the Arabs who will have anxious times in store.

Results of Poll on Gulf Crisis Published

PM0709100190 Moscow MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI in Russian No 35, 2 Sep 90 p 13

[Unattributed report: "What Do People in the USSR Think of the Persian Gulf Conflict? Sociological Barometer"]

[Text] For a long time the USSR supplied Iraq with weapons and rendered it other military aid.

Do you believe that the Soviet Union bears responsibility for Iraq's invasion of Kuwait?

yes, to a great degree	15%
yes, to some degree	38%
no, it bears no responsibility	24%
can't say exactly	23%

Do you approve of the position taken by the USSR Government with regard to this conflict in the Persian Gulf?

yes	47%
no	7%
can't say exactly	46%

The results of the poll (preliminary figures) conducted by the All-Union Center for the Study of Public Opinion in the period 10-23 August this year on the basis of an all-Union representative sample. The poll covered 1,014 people from 19 population centers in 10 regions of the country.

Iranian View of Crisis, Iraqi Actions Described

PM0709103590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Report by IAN correspondent S. Tatarinov "specially for IZVESTIYA": "Iran: When Joy Goes Hand in Hand With Anxiety"]

[Text] Tehran—A cacophony of automobile horns, whoops of joy, and whining police sirens brought me out onto the balcony. Not far from the apartment block a convoy of buses with escort was moving slowly along an elevated stretch of highway. Smiling people were leaning out of windows. They were waving national flags and bunches of flowers. Car passengers were trying to reach up to their hands, risking falling onto the road.

It was Tehran greeting soldiers and militia personnel returning from imprisonment. Many of them had spent nearly 10 years behind barbed wire in a foreign country. Now the celebration of freedom: a sea of flowers, compatriots in raptures, bursts of submachine-gun fire saluting them, generous words of gratitude from the country's top leaders. "The greatest victory for the Islamic revolution," Iranian Foreign Minister 'Ali Akbar Velayati called Iraq's decision to recognize the 1975 Algiers agreements between the two countries and send the prisoners of war home. This meant the end of the war and of captivity for nearly 100,000 people on both sides of the Iran-Iraq border.

One can only guess now what would have become of these people had the threat of a new war in the Persian Gulf not arisen. You may not agree with this statement, of course, but I think that, had it not been for Iraqi aggression in Kuwait, Baghdad would scarcely have been in such a hurry to settle relations with Iran. As the Tehran paper KAYHAN INTERNATIONAL wrote, Iraq urgently needed to secure its "eastern front."

Ever since the Iraqi invasion Tehran has made its strongly negative view of this military adventure clear.

On 3 August Iran unequivocally condemned the occupation of Kuwait and demanded the unconditional withdrawal of Iraqi forces. Although, objectively speaking, it should be noted that the attitude toward Kuwait in Iran is decidely equivocal. For eight long years the Kuwaitis gave considerable financial support to Iraq in its conflict with Iran. I visited Kuwait at the time and I remember thinking even then, on arriving from Tehran, that the glittering prosperity of Kuwait City was very fragile. But the danger to this small state came from an unexpected quarter....

There is another important aspect. Iran reacted negatively to the transfer of large contingents of U.S. ground and air forces to Saudi Arabia. The rapidly increasing number of U.S. warships in the Persian Gulf is also causing apprehension here.

"Our people are only just beginning to return to the joys of life following the exhausting war," an eminent Iranian journalist told me, asking not to be named. "Iran supports the UN economic sanctions against Iraq, but we do not want a war and more casualties."

Alas, we already have them. Over 50,000 Iranian citizens permanently resident in Kuwait were forced to abandon their homes and return to Iran. On humanitarian grounds, the authorities have allowed foreign citizens to leave Iraq and Kuwait via their territory. There are now around 500,000 refugees at the Iranian border. You continually encounter vehicles with Kuwaiti license plates in the capital. They belong to Pakistanis, Indians, and Sri Lankans returning home.

The Iranian Government is prepared, if the need arises, to assist the return home of Soviet people currently in Iraq.

What worries the Iranian public is how the former prisoners of war are going to adapt to normal life. An office has been set up in the country to deal with "releasees," as they call them. President Hashemi-Rafsanjani has called for proper concern to be shown for the needs of the former prisoners of war.

It should be noted that their families enjoyed special respect all the years they were in prison. They were given considerable material assistance through a special fund. The children of prisoners of war were given priority when it came to education. And no one ever doubted the courage of these people and their loyalty to their military duty for the simple reason that fate willed that they should end up in prison.

Tehran is well aware of the cost of war. That is why Iran's approach to the Persian Gulf crisis is predominantly one of caution and circumspection. "The main thing is not to allow ourselves to be drawn into a new conflict," it is believed here.

Commentary Urges Review of Palestinian Issue

LD0709170890 Moscow International Service in Arabic 1400 GMT 7 Sep 90

[From the "Corner of the Palestine Arab People" program]

[Text] We begin today's program with a statement by Soviet orientalist Vitaliy Naumkin, deputy head of the Oriental Institute at the USSR Academy of Sciences, given to our correspondent, who asked him to comment on the PLO's attitude toward the aggression on Kuwait and the possible development of events in the Middle East. Vitaliy Naumkin said: The PLO's attitude toward the Gulf crisis is understandable. We, the friends of the Palestinians, are certain the Palestinians, on their part, understand the curret difficulties the USSR faces. However, the Iraqi aggression on Kuwait clearly has served Israel.

The past month has shown that Israel and otner countries have been trying to divert attention from the Palestinian cause and to isolate it from the question of settling the Middle East problem.

I am confident, Vitaliy Naumkin said, that all the friends and loyal supporters of the Palestinian people should today try their best to divert the attention of world public opinion to the Palestinian question.

The USSR understands fully that if the Middle East question and the Palestinian question had been solved, the current events in the region, particularly in the Arab world, would most probably have not occurred.

It is worth mentioning the importance of concentrating on Israel public opinion. The USSR has adequate channels to convince Israeli public opinion, or at least those circles that realize Israel must under current conditions think seriously of steps leading to the just solution of the Palestinian question. First and foremost, it must begin a constructive dialogue with the Palestinians.

Vitaliy Naumkin said: I believe that if Israel were not to do so now, other flashpoints would develop in the area that would harm Israel itself.

It would be difficult then to talk about the guaranteeing of security for the people of Israel because Israel cannot guarantee its own security by military means alone, as the current situation in the region shows.

Sub-Saharan Africa

South African Party 'Propaganda' Discussed

MB0709124090 Moscow in English to Southern Africa 1900 GMT 6 Sep 90

[Commentary by Aleksandr Fedorov—read by announcer]

[Text] Even if you do not know the Nationalist Party's schedule for holding its conferences in the provinces you can set the date for them without making a mistake. On

the eve of each one the Nationalists sharply increase the quantity of their propaganda and they advertise their program for establishing a new democratic and flourishing South Africa.

A few days before the conference in Natal, for example, all the white South African newspapers carried a two column report from the management of the Reserve Bank. The deductions on (?focus) are supposed to create a uniform opinion among the South Africans [words indistinct] all shall be well with the money in their pockets and their bank accounts. That is of course, in the country shall be managed by the Nationalist Party. [as heard]

A no less major advertising campaign awaited the public on the eve of the conference opening in the Orange [Orange Free State] province. Here the main emphasis was that only the Nationalists could calm down the conflicts between the Africans and work out a program in answer to the interests of all those who live in South Africa.

There is nothing sensational about such propaganda. The sensation is in the unconditional proof the delegates at their provincial congresses are in giving to the idea of renewing the Nationalist Party by opening it up to representatives of all racial groups in the country. It must have been difficult for them to reconcile themselves to this. Here it is necessary to take into account the elite position the party held for decades and the theory of white supremacy, and even moreso are members of the Nationalist Party.

Events lead to the conclusion that the party may keep its leading role in establishing a new democratic and flourishing South Africa only in the event it has the support of the entire population. Although the provincial conference documents approve of a multiracial Nationalist Party I suggest those above and below do not always hold the same view. In the recent poll taken by recorders of the Johannesburg staff, the results showed many of the whites are afraid of desegregation. No doubt they fear a political marriage with the Inkatha party. Chief Buthelezi's organization is proposing the possibility of combining the membership of the Nationalist Party with the [word indistinct] Inkatha.

Many of the Nationalist Party members understand, and take into account, that Mr. Buthelezi's supporters continue their undeclared war against African organizations despite the peace agreements. Did not membership in the Nationalist Party give Inkatha a greater chance for political influence in its battle with its rivals? This is not the only reason for a member of the Nationalist Party members' guarded attitude towards Inkatha. Rumors have been circulating in South Africa for a long time about a multi-stage selection of the participants in the forthcoming large-scale talks. Its aim is to weaken the present monopoly of the ANC [African National Congress] in holding a dialogue with the government. I suggest the rioting forces may use the membership of the Buthelezi supporters to try to move the ANC aside. Similar manoeuvres being planned would be able to undermine a constitutional settlement and fan the flames of ethnic and political conflict in the African camp.

The supporters of the latest Nationalist Party now feel it is able to somehow stand above the conflicts and passions and take on the role of impeccable judge. It is hard to argue that point, at least as long as the fratricidal war between the African organizations continues. Unfortunately, the best decisions will only remain on paper while some leaders and supporters of opposition organizations continue to push their own narrow political aims.

Commentary Views Arrests of Zanzibar Dissidents

EA0809112790 Moscow International Service in Amharic 1530 GMT 28 Aug 90

[From the "Africa As We See It" program]

[Excerpts] REUTER has revealed that three government opponents were arrested in Zanzibar last Monday [27 August] after talking with Amnesty International. Here is a commentary on this by Aleksandr Mikhaylov:

Those arrested were: Muhammad Makame, a former health minister; and (Juma Migbal) and (Said Raisi), well-known labor union members. They are now among about 100 people deemed by Amnesty International to be political prisoners. It is worth mentioning that the Amnesty representatives came to Tanzania to obtain facts about these people. Moreover, the political opponents of the government were arrested at a time when Zanzibar is facing many problems and a pre-election campaign is under way. [passage omitted]

The people of the island, which is united with Tanzania, harbor ill-feelings due to their low living standards. Moreover, the problems facing Zanzibar relate to the activities of the central government as well as to those of the former Tanzanian leader, Julius Nyerere. The goals that the forces opposing the government are (?fighting) for are numerous. They include: more places for Zanzibar representatives in the Tanzanian Government; secession of the island from the whole country; democratization or dissolution of the Chama Cha Mapinduzi party; and the formation of new political parties. Liberals and extremists have currently adopted the same (?stance).

It has become a common saying that (Henry Sakil) is not capable of carrying out the economic transformation of the island and strengthening (?her) opportunist stance. The current Tanzanian leaders cannot tolerate this view. The Chama Cha Mapinduzi Executive Committee has decided that Abdul Wakil will not be a candidate in the coming election. They (?nominated) Salmin Amour Juma for the presidential position of Zanzibar. [passage omitted]

It is difficult to foretell what kind of changes will take place in the island after the new president of Zanzibar comes to power. However, it is clear that he will consider the views of the government opponents as well as the economic and political dissatisfaction of the inhabitants of the country.

West Europe

Gorbachev, Kohl Examine 'Pressing' Issues

LD0709172290 Moscow TASS in English 1613 GMT 7 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow September 7 TASS—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl talked on the phone today, as part of their regular exchange of opinions, on the preparation of joint documents related to German reunification, it was officially announced here.

They also discussed pressing international issues.

Kohl Invites Gorbachev, Bush to Visit 3 Oct

LD0709180690 Moscow TASS in English 1633 GMT 7 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Serov]

[Text] Bonn September 7 TASS—West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl invited Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and U.S. President George Bush to attend celebrations on the occasion of the reunification of Germany, due to take place in Berlin on October 3. He extended this invitation in telephone conversations that he had today with the two leaders.

A government spokesman said at a news conference here today that both presidents promised to examine their schedules and tell Chancellor Kohl next week whether or not they can accept the invitation. Kohl intends to send similar invitations to Margaret Thatcher and Francois Mitterrand.

The West German chancellor discussed with Gorbachev financial matters dealing with the temporary deployment of Soviet troops on GDR territory. He talked with the American President about the Gulf crisis and the forthcoming Soviet-American summit in Helsinki. U.S. Secretary of State James Baker will arrive in Bonn on September 15 to discuss the situation in the Gulf and the U.S. demand that West Germany take part in financing U.S. military preparations in that region.

Shevardnadze Confers With Finnish Counterpart

LD0809193990 Moscow TASS in English 1853 GMT 8 Sep 90

[Text] Helsinki September 8 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze, who accompanies Gorbachev in his visit to Helsinki for consultations with President George Bush, met at the Finnish Foreign Ministry with his Finnish counterpart Pertti Paasio.

Baltic Environment Discussed

LD0909122890 Helsinki Domestic Service in Finnish 0600 GMT 9 Sep 90

[Text] The protection of the Baltic Sea and the reduction of industrial emissions in the Kola Peninsula were discussed in talks between the Soviet and Finnish foreign ministers yesterday evening. Eduard Shevardnadze and Pertti Paasio both stressed the importance of cooperation in the solution of the problems. The foreign ministers exchanged views, among other things, on the recent Nordic premiers' meeting in Sweden to discuss protection of the Baltic Sea. In their talks at the Foreign Ministry, Shevardnadze and Paasio also discussed the situation in the Persian Gulf.

Gorbachev To Receive Italian Prize Personally

LD1009073190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0530 GMT 10 Sep 90

[Text] These are the contents of a telegram from the EFE news agency, from Italy:

President of the Soviet Union Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev is the winner of the fiugi 90 prize, according to Prime Minister Andreotti, who is cultural chairman of the Fiuggi fund's general council.

The prize is named after the town which lies 80 km from Rome and is awarded to the person whose social and political activity is exceptional to defending human rights.

Giulio Andreotti reported that he sent a telegram to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev informing him of this news, of this event, and that, according to him, the Soviet leader will be coming to recieve the prize personally.

I add that the Fiuggi prize is 500 million Italian lire, or $417,000.

Yakovlev Meets Visiting Swedish Delegation

LD0709174490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 7 Sep 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Comrade Yakovlev today met with a Swedish parliamentary delegation on the present stage of perestroyka in the USSR and the sovereignty and independence of the union republics. Berner, Sweden's ambassador to the USSR, participated in the meeting.

The Swedish parliamentary delegation left for home later in the day.

Before flying out, Thage Peterson, chairman of the Riksdag and head of the delegation, held a news conference on the results of the five-day trip to the Soviet

Union. During that time, he said, the delegation managed to acquaint itself with the work of the Soviet parliament at various levels, in Moscow, Irkutsk, and Omsk. The changes now taking place here, stressed Thage Peterson, are arousing tremendous worldwide interest, Sweden included. People there are greatly interested in expanding economic cooperation with your country.

One serious barrier to this, alas, is the growing indebtedness of Soviet foreign trade departments and their failure to fulfill contractual obligations.

We understand, said the head of the Swedish delegation, that this is a temporary difficulty that can be surmounted.

He expressed confidence that the improvement in our relations could be substantially aided by the development of interparliamentary links, in particular the exchange of delegations of young parliamentarians.

Latin America & Caribbean

Cuban Vice Minister Cited on Soviet Aid

PM0709121590 Moscow MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI in Russian 2 Sep 9 p 12

[Report by Yelena Gorovaya: "In the Shadows of Ideology; USSR's Relations with Cuba Discussed by Cuban Diplomat and Soviet Political Scientist"]

[Text] Could the Cuban revolution have survived and held out for over 30 years without the Soviet Union's economic, military, and political support? Cuban First Vice Foreign Minister Jose Raul Viera answered me without enthusiasm: "Hardly, I think...."

The scale of estimates of the volume of Soviet aid to Cuba is quite wide. The published official sum of the debt is 15.5 billion rubles [R]. If that figure was reckoned on the same basis as the sum of the Soviet military budget then it is to be supposed that in reality it is higher.

"Why do you not publish the figures reflecting the volume of Soviet aid to Cuba according, naturally, to Cuban economists' calculations? That would in many ways remove the lack of clarity?"

"Why?" says R. Viera. "We do not consider it necessary. The USSR publishes the figures—well, that's your business.... I merely note that for some reason no one asks why the United States presents its allies with billions...."

I asked R. Viera how the persecution of dissidents can be reconciled with democracy—if it exists in Cuba.

"Democracy and liberalism are different things. And in my country I have the right to ban what causes harm."

"And the Fidel cult? Why has he been elected continuously for decades to the supreme state posts while the number of people dissatisfied with the regime is growing in the country (I have heard there are one million of these people)?"

"That is a myth. The people love Fidel and if general elections were to be held in Cuba tomorrow he would win without fail."

"So why not hold such elections in that case?"

"But why? To gratify the United States?"

It would be a good thing to understand the motives which prompt the Soviet Union to subsidize its friends to the detriment of its onw not entirely sated people and its own not entirely flourishing economy—friends who in addition accuse the USSR of betraying socialist ideals.... "Considering Moscow's economic difficulties one can only suppose that these investments are of considerable value to those who make them," I was told by Elliot Abrams, the "architect" of U.S. Latin American policy in the Reagan administration.

In an attempt to understand these motives E. Abrams gave three versions of "current Soviet behavior": 1) "There is less glasnost than there seems and Soviet actions simply do not accord with Soviet rhetoric"; 2) "a certain complexity in the political positions of Gorbachev, for whom a public fight with Castro is disadvantageous right now"; 3) "Gorbachev has not yet changed Soviet policy in the Caribbean basin because so far sufficient pressure has not been placed on him to force him to do so or to lead him to do so."

"I will put a fourth 'version,'" I was told in response by Raul Viera. "Gorbachev realizes that the United States presents a threat to Cuba and he therefore feels a moral duty, moral responsibility toward it. In addition the USSR, like any other country, needs allies. After all the United States has not removed its military bases from either Turkey or Europe...."

Until recently it was ideological interests which remained the main ones in Cuba for the USSR. As for political influence manifested in the coordination of key avenues of foreign policy, it is hardly worth exaggerating it. You only have to recall Angola: It is claimed that the USSR knew of the Cubans' decision to render international aid only when the Cuban fleet was already plowing through the Atlantic.

Another speculation may be made on the nature of Soviet interests in Cuba, a more "materialistic" one: Cienfuegos port.

"Cienfuegos?... Yes, the conditions for the entry of submarines are perfectly suitable there," Raul Viera agrees. "The depth is 700-800 meters right next to the shore. But if Soviet submarines did indeed come here regularly the world would long have known it from American photographs."

Well, the "ideological" aspects of Soviet interests on Cuba have grown dim while the "material" interests have not emerged clearly. At any right they do not show on photographs yet....

Incidentally, although the island has kept afloat for 30 years thanks to Soviet aid the Cuban are by no means inclined to overestimate this aid. Here are R. Viera's three arguments: First, part of the funds invested is now benefiting the Soviet Union itself—for instance, Cuba is receiving "afghan" servicemen and small children from the Chernobyl zones. Second, not all Soviet deliveries to Cuba meet world standards in terms of quality: "Your trucks, machine tools, and equipment are iron which no one buys." And finally in the Cuban diplomat's opinion one should not shift the blame: "One forms the impression that you are trying to make the 'third world' to blame for your own mistakes and to explain your economic plight by your aid to the developing countries...."

Of course, the billions which have settled in Cuba and other "third world" countries are far from the only and perhaps not the most reliable "capital investments." There have been bigger losses. But why should even smaller losses be justified by the existence of big ones?

Supreme Soviet

Lukyanov Chairs Supreme Soviet Presidium Meeting

LD0809103790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 8 Sep 90

[Text] A session of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium was held in the Kremlin today under the chairmanship of Comrade Lukyanov. It discussed the meeting of the USSR Supreme Soviet which opens on 10 September. It drew up recommendations to be discussed at the session.

Lukyanov Holds News Conference on Supreme Soviet

Agenda, Work Procedure Finalized

LD0809113790

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 0800 GMT on 8 September carries a four-minute report by correspondent Vera Shchelkunova from the building of the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin at which a news conference by Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, is reportedly in progress.

Shchelkunova begins her report saying that the news conference was delayed for 25 minutes, which she says Lukyanov attributed to his attending a USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium meeting to finalize the agenda and work procedures to be proposed at the fourth Supreme Soviet session to open on 10 September.

Shchelkunova continues: "The session will obviously be a very strenuous one because it is necessary to examine a colossal number of questions for the Supreme Soviet to act as a stabilizing body that will take care of strengthening law and order and perfecting the Union." "On the whole, the questions have been formulated in blocks. Naturally, the very first block is measures concerning the transition to a market economy.

"This program will be a single program. Anatoliy Ivanovich also told us that the meeting yesterday chaired by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to assess and bring together these drafts ended at 2330. It has been agreed that they will be issued as a single draft to the deputies at the session. It is true that there are divergencies. They will be presented as variants. Very important in my view is the fact that these drafts, well, drafts and variants, will be examined both at the USSR Supreme Soviet session and at sessions of the supreme soviets of the Union republics. There and then, together with this program, a range of bills connected with this program will be submitted.

"The majority of the republics, Anatoliy Ivanovich said, will reach common conclusions on these questions, on the most important questions. These are that we need one monetary system, a single customs service, and a single flexible republican-union system of banks. This is of course a priority."

Shchelkunova goes on: "It is intended to submit 31 bills for examination by the session out of the approximately 100 now in the portfolio of the Supreme Soviet Presidium." She says that they have just begun taking questions at the news conference and continues: "A natural question—the first on the tip of everyone's tongue—is why are the laws that have already been passed not being carried out, and what is the stance of the Supreme Soviet and of its chairman in connection with the fact that the Ryzhkov government is on the whole not carrying out these laws—that is to say, is not coping with its obligations? Anatoliy Ivanovich explained that he, as chairman of the Supreme Soviet, must be above quarrels and will not express his view; but he is in favor of stability. This is the view he expressed. He said that if such a question arises it will be resolved in accordance with the constitution."

Shchelkunova concludes: "The session will last until the end of December, and at the end of December it is planned to hold a Congress of People's Deputies at which the basic questions of our federation will be submitted. The Union treaty must of course be drawn up during the session so that it can be adopted at the congress."

Session Seen as Stabilizing Factor

LD0809125790 Moscow TASS in English 1231 GMT 8 Sep 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Andrey Orlov]

[Text] Moscow September 8 TASS—The fourth session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, which will open in the Kremlin on September 10, "should be a factor of stabilisation in the country", Soviet Parliament Chairman Anatoliy Lukyanov told a news conference here today.

The first day of the Parliamentary proceedings will be devoted to the discussion of Lukyanov's report.

"On the second day, we plan to switch to the discussion of urgent measures to stabilise the situation in the country," Lukyanov told journalists.

"At a meeting held in the run-up to the session under the chairmanship of President Mikhail Gorbachev and involving representatives of the Union and the republics, it was agreed that a unified programme for the country's transition to a market would be submitted to the session of the Union and Republican Parliaments," Lukyanov said.

Lukyanov believes that tabling alternative variants "would not contribute to stabilisation in the country".

Asked by TASS who personally will present this programme, Lukyanov said that the country's government was entrusted to do it.

Asked about the frequently mentioned possibility of the Soviet Government's resignation if its programme for the transition to a market is rejected, Lukyanov said: "If

this proposal is made, it should be viewed in line with the established procedure—after the government's report and with account of the opinion of the parliamentary committees and commissions". Lukyanov recalled that two thirds of the Soviet Parliament members' votes will be needed for the government to step down.

All in all, the Parliament's "market package" comprises 20 bills, including those on banks and bank activity, pricing mechanisms, currency circulation, the general principles of enterprise, employment, social protection, investment, including foreign investment, and on protecting intellectual property.

The drafts of the country's plan and budget will be submitted to the parliamentary committees and commissions at the end of September. "We plan to adopt these documents, envisaging the important tasks of driving down inflation and stripping the state of its monopoly on the economy, late in December," Lukyanov stressed.

Among other issues on the session agenda, Lukyanov singled out work to draft a new Union treaty, the second reading of the drafts on freedom of conscience, militia, entry and exit from the USSR, and some others.

The national legislature "will consider the first reading of the draft military reform, which has already been submitted for consideration to the Parliamentary Committee on Defence and State Security.

Legislators will also focus on strengthening the Supreme Soviet's control functions, specifically checking the effectiveness of the previously adopted laws, and on the government's reports.

USSR people's deputies will convene for a regular session at the end of the year to discuss the pivotal issues of renewing the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, stabilising the situation in the country and rotation of the Parliament's members.

Shift to Market Economy Main Issue

LD0809193690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 8 Sep 90

[Remarks by USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman Anatoliy Lukyanov at a news conference in Moscow on 8 September; correspondent V. Stepanyuk provides introductory and closing remarks; from the "Vremya" newscast—recorded]

[Text] [Stepanyuk] The head of the Soviet Parliament reported that the basic proposals for the agenda of the forthcoming session, which had previously been examined in the committees and commissions, were formulated at the Supreme Soviet Presidium today. It is proposed to consider first of all a package comprised of 13 draft laws on the transition to the market economy. Deputies will continue their elaboration of the draft all-Union treaty.

Among the main issues on the agenda is the approval of the plan and budget for 1991. This is the year when our country goes over to market relations and when many enterprises are removed from state control and are transferred to family or collective ownership. Acts strengthening the legal basis of perestroyka will be considered in the first reading. The role of the Supreme Soviet in these processes, in the opinion of Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov, must increase significantly.

[Lukyanov] We are counting on the country's higher power bodies and the Supreme Soviet as a whole to come forward with a strength which is such that it will actively facilitate a stabilization of the situation and the bringing into order of interethnic relations in the country. The Supreme Soviet must emerge onto a qualitatively new level of work as a permanently functioning legislative and monitoring body of the country.

It must work actively in this setting, gathering pace and taking into account to a maximum degree the opinions of the population as well as the opinions of our electorate, and revealing all of the possibilities and the whole of the creative potential of the deputy body, of the Union deputy body, and of the whole deputy body of our country.

[Stepanyuk] It is proposed to include 31 laws altogether on the agenda. Evidently this is the maximum possible, especially if it is taken into account that more than 100 drafts are awaiting their turn in the parliamentary portfolio. It is proposed that the session will continue until the end of the year.

It is planned to call the next Congress of USSR People's Deputies in December during which, as a result of rotation, the composition of the Supreme Soviet will be renewed by one fifth. A total of 700 Soviet and 500 foreign correspondents accredited to the parliament will report on the work of the session.

Yakovlev Optimistic Despite 'Negative Processes'

LD1009095690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0910 GMT 10 Sep 90

["Report from the Kremlin" by TASS parliamentary correspondents Lev Aksenov, Boris Zverev, and Andrey Orlov]

[Text] Moscow 10 Sep (TASS)—The enormous significance of the fourth session of the USSR Supreme Soviet which opened here today was stressed in a TASS interview with USSR Presidential Council member Aleksandr Yakovlev.

He said that he looks to the future with optimism since, in his view, "the negative processes developing in the country can be stopped".

In answering a question from the TASS correspondent on the possibility that "Nikolay Ryzhkov, the head of the government, will deliver the Stanislav Shatalin group's program at the session", Aleksandr Yakovlev said: "I

think that comrade Ryzhkov will deliver his own program. What that program will be is quite a different matter". Assessing at the correspondent's request the chances that this program will be adopted by parliament, the member of the USSR Presidential Council answered: "It's hard to say. The mood among the deputies is very varied".

Regarding the question which has been raised frequently of late of the possible resignation of the Union government should the program be rejected, Aleksandr Yakovlev suggested "a very careful attitude to such matters". Should events turn out like that, then in his view time would be lost and that is something which "we just don't have, we have already overrun our countdown".

Answering a question as to whether Mikhail Gorbachev has made a final choice in favor of one option for economic reform or the other, Aleksandr Yakovlev answered: "I think he has".

Radio, TV Coverage of Supreme Soviet Detailed

LD0909123790 Moscow GOVORIT I POKAZYVAYET MOSKVA in Russian 10-16 Sep 90 p 2

[Excerpts] The fourth session of the USSR Supreme Soviet opens on 10 September. [passage omitted]

In their coverage of the session proceedings, "Mayak" and "Latest News" journalists propose to pay more attention to the proceedings of the Supreme Soviet committees and the commissions of its chambers. But the sessions themselves will also continue to be covered fairly broadly. There will be up-to-date information in "Latest News" bulletins during the working day of the session. There will be a diary of the session after the evening "Latest News" bulletin at 1900 [1500 GMT]. Live reports are planned on "Mayak" from the foyer of the Kremlin Hall where the session is being held at 0940, 1430, and 1730.

Naturally everyone wants to know whether "Mayak" will continue to broadcast recorded relays of the session. No final decision has yet been made; only the Supreme Soviet can decide.

Television reports on the latest day of proceedings of the USSR Supreme Soviet session will be carried on the second program of Central Television daily in the evening after "Diary of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Session".

They will be broadcast in the same order the following day on the "double" channels for eastern regions of the country.

Political & Social

Gorbachev Party Returns to Moscow From Helsinki

LD0909194590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1915 GMT 9 Sep 90

[Text] President Gorbachev has returned to Moscow from Helsinki where he met with U.S. President G. Bush. At Vnukovo Airport M.S. Gorbachev was met by N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; A.I. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet; and USSR Presidential Council members and other officials.

E.A. Shevardnadze, Presidential Council member and USSR foreign minister, and E.M. Primakov, Presidential Council member, returned together with M.S. Gorbachev.

Moscow Radio Predicts Ryzhkov Will Resign

LD0909130690 Moscow in Spanish to Spain 2000 GMT 8 Sep 90

[Text] Will the cabinet of Soviet Premier Nikolay Ryzhkov be able to stay in power, or will it be the first one in the history of the USSR to taste the bitter fruit of forced resignation? The subjective notes of Radio Moscow's commentator Vitaliy Gurov attempt to find an answer to this question.

Without any doubt, he writes, the problem has become visibly acute at this particular moment on the eve of the start of the autumn session of the Soviet parliament set for 10 September. It is possible to think that in the first days of the session's work the question of the government's resignation will be raised. Will such a possibility be perhaps unprecedented for Nikolay Ryzhkov and his team? Not at all. He already knows what the minutes of waiting for the results of a vote are like in a vote of confidence in the government. So far everything has turned out well for him.

Meanwhile, one might recall that the latest wave of proposals concerning the resignation of the government rose up earlier in May. Subsequently it was promoted in June with some intervals in between. And finally, a couple of weeks ago the resignation was emphatically proposed by the representatives of the new leadership of Russia, the largest federated Soviet republic which at present to a large extent determines the relations between the center and the republics.

Well, our commentator Vitaliy Gurov writes, one can naturally talk of the need to have confidence in the government. One can endlessly expect of it the adoption of certain extraordinary measures to stabilize the country's economy. However, Vitaliy Gurov writes, setting aside economic positions at the highest level and putting oneself in the place of an ordinary man for whom the economy is shop counters, a series of questions can be asked. In the country which extracts an enormous amount of oil, where do the detergents disappear? Where

does the gasoline go? Why, for the country's leadership, are bad harvests so much to be feared when now it is unable to organize the gathering of a record harvest? How have cigarettes vanished and why have problems arisen in the supply of bread? Perhaps it is impossible to find reasonable answers to these questions.

At the same time our commentator Vitaliy Gurov writes that the government is getting desperate to find a way out of the economic crisis which is beginning to look dangerous. It suddenly does so by proclaiming a program of extraordinary measures or by talking of the need to orchestrate a program of transition to the market. But after its rejection by the Supreme Soviet, it drafts a new one which is essentially a simple reworking of the old one. It is obvious in such a situation that everyone should express their discontent with the government—those on the right and those on the left, those at the bottom and those at the top—and the government's only options are to resign or embark upon a desperate struggle.

For the moment the second way has been chosen and the resignation can only be put off with the support of the president. He, for his part, would like to keep Ryzhkov with his cabinet. Anyway, that is what appears to be indicated by both Mikhail Gorbachev's interventions and the series of resolutions which he has adopted recently. This is apparently due to the fact that this cabinet for the moment remains faithful to the president's formula: a strong center with strong republics.

Well, what are the prospects for Ryzhkov's cabinet? My personal opinion, our commentator Vitaliy Gurov writes, is as follows: The most probable thing is that it will find itself forced to resign. Both the president and the country's Supreme Soviet intend to postpone the final solution for the moment, our commentator Vitaliy Gurov writes in conclusion.

Union Treaty Consultations Held in Kremlin

90UN2753A Moscow SOYUZ in Russian
No 33, Aug 90 p 3

[Report: "For a Union of Sovereign Republics"]

[Text] Consultations between working groups of the USSR and the Union republics on concepts of new Union relations continue in Moscow. Authorized representatives of the Supreme Soviets of the Tajik SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] and the Turkmen SSR set forth their views on 8 August at a "roundtable" in the Faceted Chamber of the Great Kremlin Palace.

On behalf of the Tajik SSR a communication was made by K.A. Aslonov, first deputy chairman of the Tajik Supreme Soviet. He was supported by A.A. Samadov, deputy chairman of the republic Council of Ministers. It was emphasized in the course of the discussion that the community of the republic supports the formation of a single Union of sovereign republics. Only in a Union is it possible to create the best conditions for an upturn of the economy, the solution of social problems, and the mutual enrichment of the cultures. In the course of the discussion attention was focused on such issues as the republics' equal representation in the Union parliament, recognition of the autonomous entities as equal subjects of the Union, the perfecting of presidential authority, the need for a solution of the complex demographic situation, and others.

The Turkmen SSR was represented at the meeting by V.G. Otchertsov, deputy chairman of the republic Supreme Soviet, and A. Charyyev, first deputy chairman of the Turkmen Council of Ministers. They declared that the creation of a renewed Union of sovereign states was dictated by historical experience and the current political situation. It is essential to provide in the treaty for the democratization of all state institutions and society as a whole, a broadening of the guarantees of man's rights and liberties, the creation of new conditions of economic integration in the interests of a rise in the well-being of all peoples living in the Union, and the development and enrichment of the national cultures and values common to all mankind. The transfer by the republics on a voluntary basis of some of their powers to the exclusive jurisdiction of the Union should not mean their removal from participation in the solution of these matters.

The following members of the working group of the USSR Supreme Soviet and USSR Council of Ministers took part in the candid and constructive discussion: G.S. Tarazevich, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities Commission for Nationality Policy and Interethnic Relations; N.N. Gritsenko, V.G. Kucherenko, and Yu.K. Sharipov, chairmen of commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union and Soviet of Nationalities; and V.Kh. Doguzhiyev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

"I would like to mention the high degree of mutual understanding achieved as a result of the discussion with the emissaries of Tajikistan and Turkmenia," G.S. Tarazevich said in an interview. "It is evident that a great deal of preparatory work was done in these republics and that account was taken of the opinion of the deputies of the local soviets and the public at large. Prominent scholars and specialists from many sectors of the economy were enlisted in the collation of the facts and their analytical study. Their proposals will be strong 'bricks' in the foundation of the new Union treaty."

Authorized representatives of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium participated in a consultative meeting in the Kremlin on 13 August. Welcoming them, R.N. Nishanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities, said:

"The USSR Supreme Soviet places a high value on the declarations of state sovereignty which have been adopted in a number of Union republics. These are important actions pertaining to a strengthening of their independence. The declarations, together with other

factors, could serve as the basis of the new Union treaty. At the same time we are all well aware that the new treaty is not starting from a blank sheet of paper, and we have no desire to erect its edifice in a void. The USSR exists, but in its present form dissatisfies us. And it would certainly be difficult to be clever enough in the present complex situation to attempt to begin the new stage of our Union with destruction and total negation.

V.B. Grinev, deputy chairman of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet, emphasized that the Union treaty should not be merely an updating of the 1922 treaty but is designed to be a fundamentally new document on the creation of a Union of sovereign states with agreed powers from the bottom up and a differentiated approach to the republics. This treaty must elaborate two important components—economic (the Union market) and political (state rights of the Union).

V.P. Fokin, deputy chairman of the Ukrainian SSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the Ukrainian State Committee for the Economy; A.P. Kotsyuba; and V.N. Pilipchuk, chairman of Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet commissions, observed that in their proposals pertaining to a Union treaty they proceed from the propositions of the Declaration on the State Sovereignty of the Ukraine.

A fundamental point was mentioned in the course of the discussion: The Ukrainian SSR recognizes the paramount quality of the values common to all mankind over class values and the priority of the generally recognized rules of international law over the provisions of intrastate law. The sovereignty of the people of the Ukraine is realized on the basis of the republic's constitution both directly and through the people's deputies. The Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet may speak exclusively on behalf of the whole people. No political party, public organization, other grouping, or individual has this right. The Ukrainian SSR guarantees all nationalities residing on its territory the right of their free national-cultural development. At the same time, however, the republic must display concern for the satisfaction of the national-cultural, spiritual, and language requirements of Ukrainians living outside its territory.

N.N. Gritsenko, V.G. Kucherenko, and Yu.K. Sharipov, members of the USSR Supreme Soviet working group; V.Kh. Doguzhiyev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; and V.N. Kudryavtsev, people's deputy of the USSR and vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, expressed the opinion that sovereign republics should join a renewed Union for the purpose of expanding and strengthening their mutually profitable bilateral and multilateral political, economic, and cultural relations. Internationally such a Union could represent an economically strong and politically stable formation.

Authorized representatives of the Kazakh SSR, a meeting with whom took place on 14 August, advocated a renewal of the USSR based on the independence of the Union republics and their voluntary cooperation and mutual assistance.

R.N. Nishanov emphasized that the eight propositions formulated by USSR President M.S. Gorbachev constitute a sound legal foundation on which relations between the future Union and the sovereign republics which are a part of it could be based. In this great work we are responsible to the fatherland, our descendants, and the peoples of all the republics.

The emissaries of Kazakhstan presented at the consultative meeting their draft Union treaty prepared by a working group of deputies of the republic's Supreme Soviet, members of the government, scholars, experts, and representatives of various public movements. The draft had been examined at meetings of the Kazakh SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and the Council of Ministers and discussed in the republic's Presidential Council.

"This document expresses to a considerable extent the opinion of the population of Kazakhstan," K.A. Abdullayev, first deputy chairman of the Kazakh SSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the republic State Planning Committee, emphasized. "But we are not laying claim to the final say, of course. The draft expresses merely the republic's viewpoint. A mutual search for compromise solutions is not ruled out."

E.L. Fedotova, deputy chairman of the Kazakh SSR Supreme Soviet; S.S. Sartayev, member of the Kazakh SSR Presidential Council and corresponding member of the republic Academy of Sciences; and N.I. Akuyev, chairman of the republic Supreme Soviet Legislation Committee, declared that in the draft Union treaty multinational Kazakhstan defines as a basic initial principle the fact that all nations and peoples in the Union are equal in mutual relations and before the law and the authorities, and that their freedom and free development are protected by law both within the framework of the Union and within the framework of each republic.

The draft Union treaty maintains that the Union republics are sovereign and possess the fullness of power on their territory, that they unite in the Union voluntarily and entrust to it the management of affairs outside and within the Union, and recognize as their common mission the strengthening of this Union.

The consultations with the Union republics will continue.

KGB Plans To Open 'Press Center' 11 Sep

LD1009134790 Moscow TASS in English 1339 GMT 10 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondents Aleksandr Borisov and Igor Gvritishvili]

[Text] Moscow September 10 TASS—Its murky past receding farther and faster into the background, the

KGB are to take another step in the spirit of glasnost by opening a press centre here on Tuesday [11 September].

In addition to the opening of the centre, KGB servicemen will hold a news conference, devoted to their new tasks in new conditions. Correspondents will get the opportunity to see an exhibition devoted to KGB activities.

According to KGB Chairman Vladimir Kryuchkov, the organisation is a multifunctional organism with a well organised management system. The KGB deals with intelligence and counterintelligence, combating terrorism, investigation of accidents and tragedies and also government communications and protection of Soviet frontiers.

Kryuchkov noted that "today, the committee has nothing to do with what it used to be in the grievous 1930s, 1940s and 1950s. There is no employee in today's KGB who was involved in events of those years."

Academic on Restoring Right to Political 'Victims'

LD0909085490

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 0709 GMT on 9 September carries a nine-minute interview with Valeriy Mikhailovich Savitskiy, doctor of juridical sciences, by an unidentified interviewer. They discuss recent decrees made by President Gorbachev. Savitskiy expresses his own lack of understanding of Gorbachev's decision to involve himself in the Kalugin affair since the decree depriving Kalugin of his awards could only discredit the president. However the August decrees restoring Soviet citizenship to dissidents and restoring rights to all of the victims of political repression from the 1920's-1950's are, in his opinion, quite a different matter. He considers them humane and an atonement for the past.

The interviewer asks Savitskiy to give the number of innocent victims who suffered during the repressions. Savitskiy replies: "The decree on the restoration of rights speaks about thousands, but thousands may also mean tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands. I think that now, at the present moment, it is unlikely that anyone can name an exact figure. But in order to imagine, if only approximately, the scale of the tragedy I will make use of data published by the USSR KGB, an organization whose posession of knowledge cannot be denied. So according to this data, from 1 January 1935 to 22 June 1941—a very good, memorable moment; the murder of Kirov and the beginning of the war—19.84 million enemies of the people were arrested. Of these, seven million were shot. That is a million a year. The majority of those remaining died in the camps."

Savitskiy then answers a question about what specifically the restoration of rights envisaged in the decree means. He speaks about the necessity of avoiding the creation of two categories of rehabilitated with those convicted during the Stalinist repressions being treated differently to those convicted after. Rehabilitation must mean the same thing for all concerned.

Savitskiy talks about the restoration of citizenship to dissidents. He claims there are hundreds of thousands of them. Gorbachev has only restored citizenship to 23 of them; what is to happen to the remainder? In Savitskiy's view, a single law should be adopted returning citizenship to all of those who were unfairly deprived of it and preventing anyone from being deprived of citizenship in the future.

PRAVDA's Role in Renewed Society Discussed

LD0709225390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 7 Sep 90

[Report by correspondent K. Grigoryeva from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] As has already been reported, more than 300 applications have been received by the USSR Printing Committee from the founders of newspapers and magazines.

[Grigoryeva] Almost 130 of these have already been handed registration certificates. And I remind you that everyone who is able to organize a journalists' collective, to reach agreement with printing workers, and of course to secure supplies of paper, has the right to publication. The State Printing Committee may only hinder those who intend to publish on behalf of unregistered public organizations. It is true that there is a way out of this situation. The publisher himself may adhere to the position of any party without declaring his membership to it. We chose a day when the publications of the CPSU Central Committee were registered. There are thirteen of them, two of them new ones, the newspaper GLASNOST and the weekly VOSKRESENYE. But there was no one to tell about their specific tasks since the founders did not come to the ceremonial procedure. But this is not true of PRAVDA's plans. Our oldest newspaper has at last been registered by the Soviet authorities. Here is part of an interview with its editor in chief.

[I.T. Frolov, editor in chief of PRAVDA] This should be a new newspaper, a new party within a renewed society. This is how I myself see its role.

[Grigoryeva] So, we speak honestly about the fact that the time is a revolutionary one. This period really does remind us very much of revolution. Are you, as editor in chief on the one hand and on the other hand simply as a reader, happy with the revolutionary nature of your newspaper?

[Frolov] If this is something which is harshly destructive, damaging, and so on then I am not happy with it. I think that there has been sufficient revolution, sufficient changes have occurred. All of these changes have affected the fate of the people, and moreover to a very great degree. The people were always suffering as it were, in essence. I think that it is necessary now to worry about

achieving a certain stabilization, a certain resolution of topical problems, first and foremost of foodstuffs and the provision of consumer goods and so on.

[Grigoryeva] But does this mean that in trying to stabilize the situation, to calm it, you will limit the information to the reader to some degree? Perhaps there will not be any acute information?

[Frolov] No, we will expand it and PRAVDA will exist, taking into account the multiparty system and the sharing of powers. And this newspaper will take up its positions here as well and accordingly on many occasions there will not simply be information but criticism as well.

[Grigoryeva] Previously every party member was obliged to subscribe to it. Now when this is not the case, do you think this will influence your circulation?

[Frolov] I think that it will.

Party Newspapers Receive Registration Documents

PM0709102290 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Sep 90 Second Edition p 1

[Report published under the "Own Information" rubric: "PRAVDA Registered"]

[Text] At the USSR State Committee for the Press yesterday the PRAVDA editorial board was handed registration certificate No. 113. In accordance with the Law on the Press, the central organ of the Communist Party is now officially recognized by the state and the country's oldest newspaper, which has been in existence since 1912, is published entirely legally like many other publications. Despite the "unlucky" number in the sequence, PRAVDA remains not only the biggest party newspaper but the biggest nationwide paper. As I.T. Frolov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chief editor of PRAVDA, noted when the certificate was presented, our newspaper will reflect the interests of different strata of the people in its pages, pursue a course of radical perestroyka of Soviet society, and uphold socialist ideas and panhuman values.

At the same time as PRAVDA, other publications founded by the CPSU Central Committee were also registered at the USSR State Committee for the Press. They include the newspapers SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, SELSKAYA ZHIZN, RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA, UCHITELSKAYA GAZETA, EKONOMIKA I ZHIZN, and GLASNOST as well as the journals IZVESTIYA TSK KPSS, KOMMUNIST, PARTIYNANA ZHIZN, and DIALOG. The new weekly publication VOSKRESENYE, which is intended for family reading, also received a registration certificate.

Status of ZNAMYA Magazine Still Unresolved

PM1009132590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent G. Alimov: "Journal ZNAMYA Registered"]

[Text] The journal ZNAMYA, which was officially refused registration by the State Committee for the Press until the rival founders of the publication have resolved their conflict, has been registered at the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Press and Mass Information Ministry.

Registration certificate number 20 shows the journal's labor collective as founder of ZNAMYA. The original registration applications from all the contenders were made to the USSR State Committee for the Press which is authorized to register all publications of all-Union status. Simultaneous claims by several founders—the editorial office collective, PRAVDA publishing house, USSR Writers' Union Board, and the collective of the PRAVDA publishing house printing plant—prevented the USSR State Committee for the Press from opting for one of them, although two candidates—the PRAVDA publishing house and printing plant collective—later canceled their founding applications.

"We turned to the RSFSR Press and Mass Information Ministry," ZNAMYA chief editor G. Baklanov said, "only when we had encountered what you might call a bureaucratic football. On the one hand, they would tell us there were no certification forms at the moment; on the other hand, they started mustering all those who want to be our founders and assembled superior commissions, not to establish the truth but to seek ways of settling the matter so that nothing was settled. We were sick of waiting. We took advantage of the right granted to us by the Law on the Press and became the journal's founder ourselves."

Your IZVESTIYA correspondent was told at the USSR State Committee for the Press that the problem has still not been solved, only one move having been made which was outside the Law on the Press. We do not know the reaction of the Writers' Union Board yet, the committee said. In any case, it is entitled to take legal action. Perhaps the USSR Writers' Union Board will agree to delegate its founding rights to the Russian Writers' Union as the status of the journal ZNAMYA has changed since it was registered at the RSFSR Press Ministry—it has become all-Russian, not all-Union.

What is the truth of the matter? One law, a variety of solutions. Is it not time the legislators expressed their stance on these problems?

Parents of Deceased Servicemen Demand Changes

LD0809174890

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1500 GMT on 8 September carries a three-minute

report by correspondent Sergey Omelchenko on the constituent congress of parents of servicemen who had died in the Army. He notes that "over the four years of perestroyka, the number of Army fatalities is 15,000 people" and he remarks that, in terms of social protection, the Army is the worst provided for.

He then interviews Anatoliya Aleksandrovna Shelduk-ova, chairperson of the Committee of Soldiers' Mothers and Mothers Against Violence, on the aims of the congress. She says that the congress participants demand an independent investigation of the deaths of their sons; fundamental military reform aimed at establishing a professional Army with the doctrine of defense sufficiency; the protection of the social rights of soldiers and sailors; obligatory insurance; compensation in the event of their death or injury; the introduction of an alternative service in the transitional period; and the elimination of construction teams which she terms "shameful" and "slave-like" formations. She says the congress wants soldiers and sailors to have the same rights and duties as any other citizen of the country.

Scientists Register 541 People With AIDS

LD1009092390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0100 GMT 10 Sep 90

[Text] Soviet scientists attended an AIDS seminar in the United States.

Vadim Valentinovich Pokrovskiy, chairman of the Association to Combat AIDS, attended the seminar. He says authorities now have data on approximately 150,000 Soviet citizens who have had contact with AIDS infected people.

A total of 541 people currently infected with the AIDS virus have been registered in the USSR. Scientists say as many as 20,000 citizens may be infected with AIDS.

Well-Known Orthodox Priest Found Axed To Death

AU1009121790 Paris AFP in English 1204 GMT 10 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow, Sept 10 (AFP)—A Russian Orthodox Church priest, Father Alexander Mene, popular with parishoners but mistrusted by his superiors, has been found hacked to death near his home in the countryside outside Moscow, INTERFAX news bulletin reported Monday.

Police at Moscow's central police headquarters said the priest was found dead Sunday near his home at Novaya Derevniya, a rural locality near Puchkino. He had been killed with an axe, INTERFAX, quoted police as saying.

Soviet emigres said Father Mene was well known beyond Soviet borders for having published several religious works aboard.

INTERFAX said Father Mene was not on good terms with the Orthodox hierarchy and that his relegation to a rural parish did "not reflect his popularity" and reputation with church-goers.

Economic

TASS Reports on Gorbachev's Market Meeting

Meeting Scheduled for 7 Sep

LD0709122590 Moscow TASS in English 1214 GMT 7 Sep 90

[By TASS parliamentary corresondents Lev Aksenov, Yuriy Kozmin, and Pavel Ostrov]

[Text] Moscow September 7 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev will hold a meeting today, at which Academician Abel Aganbegyan will present conclusions and proposals on the implementation of a programme to transfer to market relations, Russian Prime Minister Ivan Silayev told economic managers of the Russian Federation today.

On the Soviet president's instructions, the mixed group, led by Academician Abel Aganbegyan, is currently working to combine the blueprint for the country's transition to market relations proposed by Academician Shatalin, and the alternative programme of the Soviet Government.

Silayev Has 'Mixed Feelings'

LD0809130590 Moscow TASS in English 1237 GMT 8 Sep 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Lev Aksenov]

[Text] Moscow September 8 TASS—Russian Prime Minister Ivan Silayev said he had mixed feelings about the Friday [7 September] meeting with President Mikhail Gorbachev.

The meeting, attended by representatives of all constituent republics and the Soviet Government, discussed options for a transition to a market-based economy.

Academician Abel Aganbegyan, appointed to arbitrate upon two alternative blueprints for the economic reform, spoke about his attempts to work out a single approach to the basic principles of the programmes.

The blueprints were prepared by the government and a group led by Academician Stanislav Shatalin.

"I think the Soviet Government's positions on some issues have approached the concept of the Shatalin group," Silayev told TASS today.

He said there remained two points of divergence "between the two programmes—interaction between constituent republics and the price policy.

"The Shatalin programme to a higher degree takes into account republican sovereignty, whereas the Soviet Government remains an advocate of centralisation," Silayev said.

"Also, the Shatalin programme, which is already being discussed by the Russian parliament, does not provide for price hikes, as does the Soviet Government's programme.

"The time is running out. Our Supreme Soviet is already working on the Shatalin programme. Yesterday, other republics, too, asked us to provide them with corresponding materials.

"This is why the Soviet president decided to wait for another two to three days and still find a possibility to work out a single programme.

"This work apparently will not be completed by the opening of the Soviet parliament's session," Silayev said. The session opens on September 10.

The Russian premier said that "if a joint programme is worked out, it should be submitted to parliament by the Soviet President."

Ryzhkov Discusses Government Economic Program

LD0709224390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1757 GMT 7 Sep 90

[Studio interview with Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, by Vadim Lobachenko; from the "In the USSR Government" program—live or recorded]

[Text] [Lobachenko] Nikolay Ivanovich, you and I met two weeks ago on this same program which has now become a regular feature on television. Two weeks is not a long time, especially in our stormy times. As each day passes, public alarm over the development of the situation increases. People are increasingly worried about the future. They want to know where a solution to the increasing difficulties is to be found.

[Ryzhkov] Good evening, esteemed comrades. Yes, Vadim Ivanovich, the political clock has sharply increased its movement now. Indeed, concern and alarm is steadily increasing. We are aware that this year the national economy has been operating under extreme strain, and this strain is steadily increasing. There is no similarity between the beginning of the year and, say, August. During this year we have failed to increase output or an increment in national income. On the contrary, national income fell by 2.0 percent compared with last year. Output has fallen by 0.6 percent. In other words, economic development has not stabilized; it has actually fallen a certain extent. These are very bad symptoms.

[Lobachenko] It is a serious picture.

[Ryzhkov] Yes the picture is complex and unpleasant because at the end of the day the country's wealth is based on production. If we produce, we can distribute the product and ensure that the individual benefits. Unquestionably we are asking ourselves what is happening in the country and analyzing the situation. Why is the situation as it is, we wonder? There are a number of objective reasons which I have mentioned in these talks—for example, the country's hard currency situation and the changing international market. But there are also subjective reasons. We consider that this year production discipline—labor discipline—has slackened very sharply. Well, just look. Over seven months we have lost 10 million man days at the expense of strikes alone.

[Lobachenko] [words indistinct] (?and that is a heavy burden on a) healthy economy (?and an even greater one on) a sick economy.

[Ryzhkov] Of course, for the situation is very serious now. Therefore the slightest disruption which takes place somewhere today has an immediate affect on another enterprise. And such a complex picture results. Everybody wonders, everybody asks why it is so bad. Yet at the same time I would say that every enterprise, as they say, contributes its own bit to this. Therefore we have asessed seriously the situation which has evolved now, and the main task now lies in us finding a solution for the remaining four months. If we do not put the situation right now, or let us say allow the situation to get worse, we will end up in a most serious situation on the threshold of 1991.

I want to read to you a telegram I received yesterday from Belorussia. The situation disturbs not only the government, it disturbs all people, it disturbs the republican administrative bodies and the oblast ones. It is an appeal by the Belorussian Republican Council of Trades Unions. I will not read it all. They express their very great concern and write: "We call on every work force to carry out in full this year the obligations they have taken on toward their partner enterprises and their consumers, and thereby lay a basis for the stabilization of the situation during the transition to market relations. Further delay is fatal; the situation could get out of control." You see the tone of this telegram.

Extraordinary measures are essential. The market transition period demands a strengthening of labor discipline, of discipline in execution. We call on the governements of the Union republics to speed up interparliamentary agreements, and on the Government of the USSR to coordinate actions in concluding economic contracts for next year.

Well, that is to do with next year already, but this is the concern being expressed about this year.

[Lobachenko] [words indistinct]

[Ryzhkov] Yes, a demand for discipline, responsibility, and order. That is the only demand. That is to say, today

everyone is demanding this even though all enterprises are also violating discipline.

The first task, of course, is to solve the question of harvesting. This is the main question. I will not dwell on it in detail, but recently the rates have fallen.

[Lobachenko] The bad weather no doubt has some sort of role in this?

[Ryzhkov] Of course it does; bad weather first and foremost. Of course it plays a role, but there are also organizational shortcomings. I repeat yet again, and I will repeat it many times more: We have set up a single national economic complex, and shortcomings in one place are bound to have an effect on another—are bound to. For that reason it is only discipline, only order that can bring us any kind of success. We are now preparing a decision in order to apply very strict, one could even say harsh measures against violators. We know very many cases where there is extortion, simply extortion: Let us say you give me some sort of item, then I will supply you with my item. It is impossible. It is impossible for a national economy to work like that. For this reason we shall use both economic methods to influence those who work like that, and I think we will also use as they say administrative methods of influence. We gathered the ministers together specially and held a very I would say serious and heated session of the Presidium of the Council of Ministers, and that did indeed discuss this. In my opinion the task is a real one, in order to put things right and not to slide further downhill, but for this we need very, very serious work over these four months. But I nevertheless take an optimistic view. We do have these possibilities.

[Lobachenko] Literally before our eyes another shortage has arisen—a bread shortage. And this in a year when nature has brought us the gift of a record harvest. Of course man does not live by bread alone, but on the other hand we simply cannot live without it. Why has this shortage of bread arisen at this time?

[Ryzhkov] Unfortunately this, so to speak, marathon of shortages goes on. As you know for almost a year we have struggled for soap, for washing powders. In the end we were able to meet all the needs. We brought in powders from all over the world and now the shops are full of it. Now a shortage has come about in certain cities, and first and foremost in Moscow and Leningrad and in several other cities—a shortage of bread. Televison viewers, I can tell you firmly that we have no grounds whatsoever for not being able to satisfy the people's bread requirements. None whatsoever. We have the grain. We have the flour. We have every possibility to be able to provide bread fully in any quantities. All that is needed is that local authorities should deal with this matter properly. It all needs to be monitored. There are seasonal fluctuations in bread consumption in the summer months—and indeed there are such fluctuations in Moscow, but there is nothing new about them; they occur every year. For instance, 1,800 tonnes of bread is consumed in Moscow. When people return from their holiday, when students arrive, then bread consumption immediately rises to 2,100 or 2,200 tonnes.

[Lobachenko] And that is a known fact?

[Ryzhkov] Yes, that is a known fact. It has not happened just this year; it always happens. There may have been times when the fluctuations were not so great which is why the situation needs to be constantly monitored. We have to be prepared for this, our equipment has to be ready, our enterprises have to be ready. We should not wait until people flock in, because then they go looking for bread and there is none. That is because, given the nature of the product, a rush is provoked immediately. And as soon as demand turns into a rush, then exceptional manufacturing arrangements are needed, not the normal quantities which are consumed but one-and-a-half times or even twice as much has to be made at once, and that is the only way of putting paid to a rush. That is what might be called bitter experience, which we already have. So all bread problems have to be dealt with locally. We have no grounds for creating a bread problem again in this country.

[Lobachenko] How do you see the prospects for fulfilling this year's plan and the plan program for next year?

[Ryzhkov] I am very bothered about 1991. There has been a slowing down in preparing the economic development plan for 1991. This year we have talked about this at a meeting of the presidium, and we instructed Comrade Mostovoy and Comrade Ryabev to get down very seriously to preparing for the winter. Let me say that in the thick of all these debates of one kind and another which are in full spate in the country, in all this talking we are doing, we have totally forgotten that ahead lies the winter.

[Lobachenko] And that is source of alarm for us.

[Ryzhkov] Yes, winter is a source of alarm for us. The last few winters have spoiled us very badly. Last winter things were disrupted very badly. And god forbid, as they say, that we have a harsh winter, and with the level of preparedness we have now, indifferent as it is, we could find ourselves in a very grave position. For this reason our discussion was serious and we called on deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers and ministers, together with the Union republics, to get on at once with looking at all preparations for the winter.

We have to determine where the bottlenecks are so that when the cold weather and the snow-drifts come we do not find that the economy has landed in a very tricky position. Fortunately, preparations for 1991... we also examined this matter at the meeting of the Presidium of the Council of Ministers, and now we have decided that the State Planning Committee, Comrade Maslyukov, and ministers and the Union republics should concentrate their primary attention on preparations for 1991. You see, this will be an unusual year not because it ushers in a new five-year period—though as you know

we do not have a five-year plan now—it is unusual because... and it is forming in new circumstances and indeed the national economy will be functioning in totally new conditions. [sentence as heard] For all that we are arguing over the programs and all sorts of debates are underway, we now have to work in a completely different economic environment. In other words, we are taking a very serious step into a market economy.

During this five-year period, which ends in four months, there has been a system of individual norms for each enterprise. That is each enterprises was told how much it had to pay into the budget and how much it retained, but individually for each enterprise. And we were greatly taken to task over this, indeed we ourselves realized the system was not perfect. A factory that functioned well had one norm and paid some of its money over to those that functioned badly, the poor factories got this from somewhere, and the ministry redistributed everything. In other words there was a kind of levelling down. That is the kind of system that has been in force and which continues in force even today, but from the new year we are switching to common taxation which is common to the entire country. Whether you work well or badly you are obliged to hand over a standard 45 percent of your profits, 22 percent to the central budget—or the federal budget as I call it—and 23 percent to the republican budget.

This is the main thing. Every enterprise today has to think and work out how it is going to exist in these conditions. If in the past the ministry had the opportunity to centralize some of the resources and use them to help someone, this is now prohibited by law. So even if the ministry wants to help someone it is unable to do so as it does not have the finance. So that is one issue.

[Lobachenko] Harsh though fair [words indistinct].

[Ryzhkov] Harsh though fair, and it is from this very angle that every enterprise and labor collective must see things. After all, for decades we have learned to fight off the plan; we do not need a bigger plan, it is easier for us to work this way. We now have to see things from a different angle. Will the collective be able to survive on the production volumes it accepts? Will it be able to earn enough for its production needs, its social needs, or not? If not, it means that it must increase production, giving it correspondingly more material resources and financial resources.

That is already market relations. Or let us take such factors as social tariff. The new law on pensions will begin to operate as of 1 January next year, and there are very great and considerable changes there. In order to increase people's pensions, the enterprise has to increase deductions. If they used to deduct different sums, enterprises deducted differently—some deducted nine percent to fourteen percent approximately, but now 38 percent has to be deducted from all. In other words, he has to tear a certain sum away from himself and give it to the country's pension fund, and the country's pension fund has to give pensioners a pension. That also changes the situation—either 10 percent or 38 percent.

Or let us take the banking system. In our country the heart of the matter is that, after all, our misfortune lies in the fact that money does not work in our country. It does not work. Interest rates on loans are very low, they do not work at all. There is a new situation in which interest rates are rather high and enterprises have to think very seriously. Well nevertheless, as they say, how can one live in such conditions? That is what market relations consist of.

The second feature of next year consists in the fact that we consider that we cannot live on purely market, purely economic relations alone next year. That would be an illusion if we said we are giving you only these economic indicators, these norms and laws, and you get on with it. That is not possible because we are still too attached to the old system, and new relations—economic relations—have not yet been elaborated between enterprises. Therefore state regulation will still account for a large share. That is why it is called a regulated market, regulation.

[Lobachenko] It will be a year of transition?

[Ryzhkov] Yes, namely a year of transition, 1991, when there will be state regulation. We have to compile state orders for a certain part of production; there have to be state orders which must be fulfilled firmly. We also need to have certain regulators which would allow the national economy to function normally. Now we are preparing a document. Perhaps we will even ask the president, or that will be a decision by the Council of Ministers, but we categorically demand that those links which exist today in 1990 be preserved. If two enterprises had some kind of relations, if this year part of their deliveries form part of a whole item, we insist and demand categorically that that is preserved in 1991. Otherwise we...the national economy is not able to work. That is state regulation. It will remain in 1991.

[Lobachenko] But it will be decreased, gradually be decreased.

[Ryzhkov] Of course it will be decreased. Naturally in the formation of the 1991 plan, we also are thinking of the structure of the management of the national economy. And there is no doubt that the structure will change. Market relations will force us to take a different view of the structure of the management of the national economy. But all our meetings with specialists, with scientists, with directors of enterprises...and incidentally there have been publications, recently, let us say, on relations between enterprises, let us say, and ministries. [sentence as heard] Everybody understands that ministries have to be different. But so far they must remain.

So our view is that as far as the management structure is concerned, one should not destroy the old management structures in one go. They should not be destroyed without creating new ones. If now, in the period in which market relations are being established, we do just this

and destroy fundamentally the entire management system, we shall end up altogether unmanageable. So our view is that we have to create new structures. We have to set up joint-stock companies, combines, and concerns, and in parallel the new structure will replace the old structure. There can only be such a natural process, of course. We must urge it on, but urge it on intelligently. I can tell you that we have excelled as far as destroying things is concerned. We have excelled very greatly, and I think we must draw serious conclusions. We must create then destroy.

[Lebachenko] It is easier to destroy than to build, is it not!

[Ryzhkov] Yes, that is true.

[Lobachenko] Nikolay Ivanovich, there is enormous interest now, as well as hopes and fears on the part of all our people, in connection with the transfer to the new market relations. After all, not just the economy but our whole life are being switched onto a new track. In literally a few days time a program for the transfer to the market is to be submitted. What is your stance and that of our government?

[Ryzhkov] It seems that this problem is today surrounded by the greatest amount of debate in our society and within the country. And all the news media and the press are crammed with this topic. Television is also giving enough attention to this matter, so to speak. I realize that this is evidently the most topical subject. And I regard this sort of reaction from the whole of society to this program as natural. At the end of last week, as one knows, a joint session of the Federation Council and the Presidential Council took place which examined, if one can put it this way, approaches to these programs because at that time, on that day, these programs were not yet ready. They only appeared a day later. And a very serious discussion took place. All the republics expressed their attitude, although the documents were not properly available.

On Saturday, the first [September], these documents appeared. The government submitted its proposals—the government program—to the president and, on the instructions of the president, Academician Shatalin also submitted a proposed program for the transfer to market relations. Thus two programs exist in reality today. On Tuesday the president held a special conference at which both of the two programs were considered. I must say that the talking was extremely tough—it was tough but useful talking, with both groups of experts voicing specific doubts and proposals. I do not really want to dwell now on the contradictions that exist. There are several questions of principle on which the points of view do not yet coincide. And I said in my speech that if one or another group is convinced that it is right, well, there is after all the Supreme Soviet, there are the supreme soviets of the Union republics. So let them adopt whatever position it may be, because that is a position. And if I believe in my position, I defend it, that position.

Well, on Tuesday the decision was made that a single program should be submitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet and the supreme soviets of the Union republics; and so both the one group and the government group were instructed to sit down now and try to find common ground after all and put forward a single program. At our request, a neutral person was chosen to head it, Academician Aganbeyan who, by the way, also headed the group on alternatives. He has now been invited to take charge of this work. I find it hard to say now what they may agree on, though there is a lot of discussion. I must emphasize that when we were exchanging views on this matter and discussing these problems, both at the end of last week and on Tuesday, we agreed in general not to publish either program at present, not to publish and not to inflame passions over this. Let us see if we cannot create something unified; we need, well, a unified stance. And if we find there are disagreements of some kind, then we must honestly say one position is this and the other is that. Unfortunately, this is not altogether being carried out, but at least the government is sticking to it very precisely and we have not published our program. We consider that we do still need to do further work.

What is our program based on and how do we see the main principles being put into practice? The main thing—without going into detail—the main thing is the issue of what the all-Union market, which must ensure the cohesion of our state, should be like. It should not divide it, not scatter it into pieces, but must on the contrary hold it together. There must be a strong state with an all-Union market in which all will be able to work with advantage—it will be advantageous to everyone, to all the producers of goods. Ultimately, the republics must have an interest in it, and correspondingly the whole state will then be strong.

That is the main and fundamental tenet which we adhere to all the time. We adhere to it all the time. No separatist tendencies must be permitted. I have even used the phrase: not political separatism but economic separatism. We must on no account allow economic separatism. That is what our position amounts to and we believe that this is the path that must be followed.

Or take such matters as, say, the circulation of money. This might seem to be something that no one has any doubts about: circulation of money. Today there is the ruble, and many think it must exist tomorrow, and I think that we must have the ruble—but a strong ruble, not a sickly one such as we have today. But unfortunately today there are a great many proposals. They say, let us have national currencies. Once you have national currencies, you have no longer got a unified monetary system. Or we think there should be a unified banking system. That is a blood-circulating organism, it is the blood vessles of the whole body and of our entire country. So it is these tenets that predetermine the integrity of our state, and we consider that precisely through the economic part we must find approaches that will change our federation, the federation of our country. So that is the main work that is now going on. We

consider that very soon these commissions will get to work, and next week evidently such a document will appear, and then it will need to be discussed in the USSR Supreme Soviet and in the supreme soviets of the Union republics.

[Lobachenko] All the more so when the whole of the civilized world is on the way to intergration. There is the Common Market, for example, the European Economic Community. Customs and economic barriers between countries are to stop by 1992. In other words, there is an awareness that it is precisely such a single market that is far more to the advantage of all the component parts.

[Ryzhkov] Tha iright. Today integration is dictated by the times. Everyone is doing it after all. The European Market is being integrated in 1992. They are making a great advance. Just look, an Asian-Pacific market is being created. Again, countries are uniting in order somehow....

[Lobachenko—interrupting] To prosper together.

[Ryzhkov] To prosper together. Or Canada and America, say. In other words, markets are being created which are integrated in order to obtain results to be attained through integration from trade and joint production. And for this reason we have to do it too. We cannot live in isolation. We cannot live with each republic closing in on itself. That is not the right road. It is a dead end. A dead end. It only seems that a republic is going to work on its own and will do everything. I have already given the figures for integration, for the integration that already exists here.

Thus, in submitting our program we believe that its distinctive feature is not just, as I have just been saying, the single economic field as I call it, but we believe that the program that we have drafted is a realistic one. It keeps its feet on the ground. You see what I mean? You can draft any fine program, but if it fails to take account of the realities of today, if it fails to take into account the real situation, it can end up totally unrealizable for all its attractive features. So we believe that our program is realistic. It is realistic. Realities are exactly what it takes account of.

[Lobachenko] I wish you success in the huge job you are doing, Nikolay Ivanovich. Thank you.

[Ryzhkov] Thank you. All the best.

Construction Fair Opens; Market Switch Backed

PM0709114390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 4 Sep 90

[Report by Ye. Vantorina and A. Kudeli from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] The annual September Fair of Scientific and Technical Achievements in the Construction Industry has opened at the Exhibition of National Economic Achievements pavilions on Frunzenskaya Embankment in Moscow.

[Reporter] More than 660 companies from various countries are displaying their manufactures here.

Statistics show how topical this fair is for us. I will cite just two examples. The investment cycle in our country is three to four times longer than in West European countries. Low labor productivity is reflected in the fact that construction workers account for one in ten of the total number of workers and employees in the Soviet Union. There are many reasons for this situation, including unbalanced planning, a poor production base, poor material and technical supply, and industries' lack of responsiveness to scientific and technical progress. Nonetheless, experts believe that the root cause is the lack of a market in the construction sphere. Creation of this market is the main objective of the economic reform in this sector.

The Stroytekhinformatika association is one of those seeking to establish and develop an information technology infrastructure in the construction industry. During the last fair this association concluded a record number of commercial contracts in comparison with other exhibitors.

[V.S. Kashpura, chairman of the board of the Stroytekhinformatika association] The switch to contract prices and direct contacts calls for accurate, reliable information. Thus demand for our output—information technology for construction management—is growing. The Kabalproyektstroy association, for instance, has bought all four of our systems—the design, planning, staffing, and accounting systems. This has enabled the association to switch to new economic relations, radically reorganize its design work, and carry it out in a totally new fashion.

Metallurgy Ministry Opens Consumer Goods Center

PM1009102490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 4 Sep 90

[Report by Ye. Savina and V. Avdeyev from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Reporter] The situation in the consumer market is disastrous. There are no goods. Instead there is a resolution, a government resolution on the organization of consumer goods production at industrial enterprises. But enterprises have a problem. One foreign trade organization buys the equipment, technology, and raw materials they need while another foreign trade organization sells their output.

An All-Union Center for Goods and Services of the USSR Ministry of Metallurgy which has opened yesterday in Moscow on Korolev Street No. 13 with the assistance of the Danish firms Ayola and GVL [as heard]

will do away with the monopoly of foreign trade organizations and take care of the consumer goods production process from start to finish.

Everything you see here [video shows clothing, footwear, kitchen furniture, Ariston and Electrolux refrigerators, Huqsvarna sewing machines, computers, cosmetics, and Lego] are projects which have already been implemented by the center and enterprises such as the Novolipetsk and Cherepovtsy metallurgical combines, the Oskol electrometallurgical combine, and others.

According to the weekly ARGUMENTY I FAKTY some $350 billion are available for investment in the Soviet Union given the right conditions. The center will offer Soviet enterprises which do not have their own foreign currency resources original solutions which will enable them to attract foreign potential without foreign currency credits.

It is now up to enterprise directors and their initiative and resourcefulness.

U.S.-Turkish-Soviet Construction Venture Formed

PM1009111690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0830 GMT 5 Sep 90

[Report by M. Pashutina from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Pashutina] A document establishing a U.S.-Turkish-Soviet joint venture was signed at the USSR Gosstroy [State Committee for Construction]. Its founders are the U.S. DST Company which helped to build the International Trade Center at Krasnaya Presnya, and the Turkish Alarka [as heard] Company which specializes in the construction of airports, bridges, and industrial and civil construction projects. The Soviet side is represented by the Mosstroy Committee, Moscow Metrostroy, and the Stroyka foreign trade firm.

The establishment of enterprises of this kind will make it possible jointly to resolve construction problems. This is particularly interesting for us.

[Yu.A. Koshelev, Mosmetrostroy chief] The Moscow Metrostroy wants to study the progressive technology which is now being used throughout the world. It also wants to make a contribution to good projects in Moscow and other cities. And we want to earn some foreign currency which we need in order to buy new high-performance equipment abroad.

Shutdown of Chemical Plant Hampers Oil Drilling

PM0709140390 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 6 Sep 90 First Edition p 1

[Report: "No Panic Stations Yet"]

[Text] Chechen-Ingush ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic]—It does not necessarily take natural disasters or general strikes to interrupt the work of the oil-drilling collectives and their thousands of workers from Brest to Sakhalin. All it takes is to halt the Karabulakskiy chemical reagent plant in Checheno-Ingushetia. The point is that you cannot drill wells without special chemical reagents. Only one plant in the country produces them. And today it is on the verge of stopping work.

The fault lies with subcontractors. For almost a month the plant's collective has been idle through the fault of the Syayskiy pulp and paper combine which has not been supplying lignosulfanate—the main raw material for the chemical reagent. Then another 300 working hours were wasted waiting for copper sulfate from Sumy. Meanwhile there were constant power outages.

It was enthusiasm alone that enabled the plant's workers to reach the six-month target. But the problems continue to mount up.

Gorbachev Recognizes Construction Workers

LD0709144190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 7 Sep 90

[Excerpt] As has been reported, by the USSR presidential decree a group of the most distinguished workers has been awarded orders and medals for their great personal contribution to the construction and commissioning of the tin-mining combine of the Yakutzoloto association ahead of schedule. [passage omitted]

Registration of Republic Enterprises Examined

LD0709175590 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 7 Sep 90

[Text] Our country's Ministry of Finance is reported to have declined to register joint enterprises located in the Baltic republics and Armenia at their request.

The registration of joint enterprises in the rest of the territory of the Soviet Union will be carried out by the Union ministry until the end of the year. Later this function will pass to republican administrative bodies. All this is connected with the process of decentralizing the Soviet economy.

Entrepreneurial Assistance Association Opens

LD0809165790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 8 Sep 90

[Summary] NAST, a new organization to assist entrepreneurial activity, has been set up in Nizhniy Novgorod. NAST stands for Nizhniy Novogorod Association of Free Manufacturers [Nizhnovgorodskaya Assotsiatsiya Svobodnykh Tovaroproizvoditeley]. The structure itself of NAST is free of diktat toward its members. Above all its aim is the effective development of the Nizhniy Novgorod economy and the development of entrepreneurship with the tasks being first of all the development of those production and economic structures which remove the problem of goods which are in very short

supply on the local market, primarily in the construction industry and everything connected with it.

Agricultural

Late August Weather, Crop Situation Reported

904B0290A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 6 Sep 90 First Edition p 3

[Article by agricultural meteorologist Ye. Solovyeva: "Weather and Crops"]

[Text] Cold weather prevailed over much of the USSR's European territory. The average air temperature in the majority of regions for the last 10-day period of August was two to four degrees lower than the annual average. In the Karelian ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic] as well as Leningrad, Novgorod, Kostroma, Vladimir, Ivanovo, Moscow, Ryazan, and Penza Oblasts, light frosts were noted at the soil surface and at an elevation of two centimeters, and in the Komi ASSR and the northern Urals region in the air. Conditions for harvest operations were unfavorable because of rains, high air humidity, and an excess of moisture in the soil. The area of downed crops has grown, and germination of the grain has been noted.

The winter grain crops are finishing up in the northern, the northern Volga-Vyatka, and the Urals regions. Where they were sown during the first half of August, the plants are tillering. The later-maturing crops have achieved the stage of shoots and the third leaf. The optimal time for sowing winter crops has arrived in the northwest, central, central-Chernozem, and Volga regions; in the south of the Volga-Vyatka and Urals regions; and in the Baltic region and Belorussia. Sowing has begun in a number of areas.

The corn has achieved golden ripeness in Moldova, the southern portion of the Ukraine, a large part of Rostov Oblast, and in the northern Caucasus, and it has achieved full ripeness in individual fields. In a number of regions where corn is cultivated for grain it has achieved milky ripeness.

The growth of the sugar beet root crop was good in a large part of the Ukraine, Belorussia, and the Baltic region. In the southern oblasts of the Ukraine, and in the northern Caucasus, growth for the 10-day period was 20 to 30 grams because of insufficient supply of moisture.

Sunflowers matured in the zone of industrial agriculture on the USSR's European territory. The average diameter of the flower head is 22 to 24 centimeters, which is two to three centimeters larger than the annual average. The condition of the plants is good for the most part.

Formation of the potato crop has ended in the Ukraine, Moldova, and the northern Caucasus and southern central-Chernozem regions. Conditions for digging up the potatoes were favorable. Over most of the European territory the potatoes had reached the stage of the withering of the tops. Conditions for the harvest were unfavorable due to cool and rainy weather.

Over a large part of the territory of the western Siberia region and the northern oblasts of Kazakhstan, conditions for the harvest of grain crops and the storage of fodder were normal. But harvest operations were hampered because of heavy rains in the eastern Siberia—except for Krasnoyarsk Kray—and far east regions.

In central Asia warm, dry weather created favorable conditions for formation of cotton bolls. By 31 August the bolls were open over 93 percent of the area, which is 40 percent more than for last year. Harvest of raw cotton continues in Turkmenia and has begun in Tajikistan and Uzbekistan under favorable agricultural and meteorological conditions.

Harvest Progress, Procurements Worse Than 1989

PM0709225790 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 8 Sep 90 p 1

["Commentary on the USSR State Committee for Statistics' Summary" by N. Osychkin: "The Harvest Must Be Saved!"]

[Text] That is the slogan now accompanying the harvest in many parts of the country. The rain and cold that have lasted since August are delaying work and jeopardizing the harvest of grain and other crops. At this time every hour and every minute are valuable. Collecting and storing everything that has been grown in the fields means replenishing the state's food and raw materials resources and better satisfying the population's needs for foodstuffs.

Just how is the harvest going? According to figures from the USSR State Committee for Statistics, on kolkhozes [collective farms], sovkhozes [state farms], and other state enterprises grain and pulse crops—excluding corn—from 61.7 million hectares had been threshed as of 3 September. This represents 62 percent of the sown area and is 25.4 million hectares fewer than had been harvested at this date last year. An average of 25.9 quintals have been harvested per hectare. Grain yields have exceeded 37 quintals in the Ukraine, 36.7 quintals in Moldova, 34.4 quintals in Lithuania, 32.3 quintals in Belorussia, and 30.6 quintals in Estonia. Over the past week grain has been harvested on just 8.6 million hectares which is only 1.3 million more than in the preceding week.

Despite the bad weather the harvest is proceeding apace on farms in Leningrad, Kemerovo, Novosibirsk, Omsk, and Tomsk Oblasts as well as Altay and Krasnoyarsk Krays, where 20 to 27 percent of crops have been threshed during the week. At the same time in Kostroma, Kirov, Chelyabinsk, Orenburg, Kurgan, Kustanay, and Tselinograd Oblasts, and the Mari, Bashkir, Udmurt, Buryat, and Tuva Autonomous Republics, just 1 to 7 percent of the sown grain has been threshed in the week. Yields per harvested area during the week were 16.1

quintals per hectare—16.7 quintals in the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic], 18.2 quintals in the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic], and 12.2 quintals in the Kazakh SSR.

In the country as a whole 160 million tonnes of grain have been threshed—almost 7 million fewer than at the same time in 1989. State resources, taking account of loan repayments, have received 46.3 million tonnes of grain—54 percent of the state order and less than one-third of the amount threshed. The state order has been fulfilled by farms in the Azerbaijan and Georgian SSR's; six autonomous republics, krays, and oblasts of the RSFSR; two Ukrainian oblasts; three Belorussian oblasts; and one oblast in Kazakhstan.

At the same time it should be noted that the pace of grain procurement remains unsatisfactory. In the week under review the country's grain reception enterprises received just 2.7 million tonnes of grain. This is 20 percent of the threshed amount and 0.7 million tonnes fewer than in the previous seven-day period. Grain sales in the RSFSR amounted to 1.7 million tonnes. Kolkhozes and sovkhozes in the Ukrainian SSR, which delivered just 175,000 tonnes during the week, have virtually suspended grain sales to the state. In Moldova, in violation of the existing procedure, grain is being reclassified out of state resources so that it can be exchanged for mixed feed. In the period 20 August through 3 September, 18,300 tonnes of grain—9 percent of the amount procured—was reclassified in this way. High-grade grain-crop seeds are reaching state resources at a low rate. The plan for their delivery has been only 33 percent fulfilled for the country as a whole.

USSR President M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has expressed serious concern at the progress of grain purchases. He has instructed the leaders of Union and autonomous republics, krays, and oblasts to take urgent measures to fulfill the state order for grain sales and to enhance the responsibility and executive discipline of cadres at all levels to resolve this task. The point is that this year there is a real opportunity to create a reliable food stock to supply the population with grain products and to meet the feed requirements of the stockraising sector. In a telegram sent to local areas, the president considers impermissible the manifestation of cases of parochialism and disdain for the interests of the statewide task of creating the necessary grain stocks.

Leaders of kolkhozes, sovkhozes, party and economic organs, and primary party organizations are called upon today to draw serious conclusions and adopt urgent measures to rectify the situation—accelerating the grain harvest without losses, stepping up shipments of grain to silos and reception centers, and fulfilling and overfulfilling state orders. It is important to strictly observe contractual discipline, to prevent grain building up at threshing floors, and to deliver it around the clock to state granaries and kolkhoz and sovkhoz storage facilities. Grain is the people's asset, and the entire harvest must be gathered in and stored in full.

The fall is the time to harvest all crops. On kolkhozes and sovkhozes corn has been reaped on 7.3 million hectares. This is 37 percent of the sown area. Flax has been harvested on 377,000 hectares, 49 percent of the sown area; vegetables on 284,000 hectares, 28 percent; and potatoes on 155,000 hectares, 7 percent. A number of oblasts have embarked on sunflower harvesting. The first 359,000 tonnes of oilseeds have been delivered to grain reception enterprises.

Gathering in the harvest is a nationwide task. In order to help out with the harvest in the Kazakh SSR, 5,672 people have come from oblasts in the RSFSR, the Ukraine, Uzbekistan, and Moldova—including 1,536 to Kustanay Oblast and 1,327 to Tselinograd Oblast. The possibility of additional combines being sent to eastern regions is being investigated, as is the possibility of sending vehicles to Tselinograd, Kustanay, and Turgay Oblasts. Some 600 combines have already been dispatched from Moldova. Another 1,000 vehicles are being sent from there too.

Now, at the final stage of the harvest it is more important than ever to observe the schedule for deliveries to the countryside of spares, fuels, and lubricants. At the same time, it has to be noted that, as of late August, agricultural consumers had failed to receive 178,000 tonnes of gasoline—the shortfall to farms being 73,000 tonnes in the Ukrainian SSR, 40,000 tonnes in the RSFSR, 26,000 tonnes in the Uzbek SSR, 9,000 tonnes in both the Belorussian and Armenian SSR's, 8,000 tonnes in the Georgian SSR, and 7,000 tonnes in the Turkmen SSR.

The situation as regards the supply of railcars to transport grain from the silos remains complex. In the first three days of September alone the number of railcars supplied to grain product enterprises by the North Caucasus Railroad fell 408 short of the plan figure and 665 short of the number actually ordered. The corresponding shortfall was 117 and 248 wagons on the Odessa Railroad, and 180 and 316 on the Southern Railroad.

Winter sowing is under way on the country's farms. Grain crops, in particular, cover 10.4 million hectares. This is 5 million hectares fewer than at the same time last year. The basic reason is that the soil and the seeds have not been prepared. Fall plowland has been plowed on 14.1 million hectares—which is 25 million hectares fewer than last year.

Yet the fall will not wait. It has made its presence felt with early rains and cold snaps. In a number of oblasts and republics emergency measures have been announced to save the harvest. It is important that this should be followed everywhere by resolute practical action in the fields, on the threshing floors, during the grain transportation process, and at the silos. The ripe harvest cannot wait. Everything that has been grown in the fields must

be harvested, stored, and supplied to the consumer. Every full hour should be given over to the present and future harvest!

Voronin Examines Harvesting Output, Problems

LD0809195790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 8 Sep 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] In accordance with the instructions of USSR President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, First Deputy Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Voronin, with the participation of representatives of the Union republics and leaders of the central ministries and departments, has examined the progress of the harvest and of the procurement of agricultural output for state resources. Attention was drawn to the low pace of harvesting work on the farms of the Non-Chernozem Zone, the Volga basin, the Urals, Siberia, and Kazakhstan. A decision was taken to extend supplementary aid in petroleum products, spare parts, and motor transportation, and also to stimulate grain sales to the state above the stipulated state order.

There was detailed discussion of the state of affairs with the harvesting of sugar beet and the commissioning of sugar projects. The provision of bread, fruit, vegetables, and tobacco goods to Moscow, Leningrad, and other industrial centers was analyzed, and concrete measures were outlined to improve the situation that has arisen.

Army Resources Allocated to Harvest Stand Idle

90UM0862A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Aug 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Report on interview with Lieutenant General A. Nadolskiy, deputy chief of the Main Army Staff, by V. Litovkin; place and date not given: "They Have Been Taken From Alert Status. Why?"]

[Text] **Thousands of Army cargo trucks are standing idle at the height of the harvest.**

As the press has already reported, 46,000 military trucks have been allotted by decree of the USSR Council of Ministers for transportation of this year's harvest . Some 92 motor transport battalions from all the military districts, groups of forces, and fleets have been assigned to grain and vegetable routes. What is the Army's real contribution to the 1990 harvest?

Our correspondent talks about this with Lieutenant General A. Nadolskiy, deputy chief of the Main Army Staff and currently chief of staff of the leadership of the motor transport battalions of the USSR Ministry of Defense.

[Litovkin] Anton Kononovich, trucks have been allotted for the harvest from all branches of the Armed Forces and all types of forces, even strategic forces. In some places, automotive transportation has even been taken off alert status. Weapons have been detached from the trucks and cases with ammunition have been unloaded. Several garrisons do not have anything with which to carry water and goods. Of course all this cannot but help affect combat readiness. Is the price of the harvest too high for the Army?

[Nadolskiy] We will calculate the price after the work is finished. That will be sometime at the end of the year. But our expenditures really are enormous. In all, 33,000 vehicles—or 66 battalions—have been allotted for the Russian Federation, for Kazakhstan 13,000 vehicles—or 26 battalions. Some 69 battalions have already been working on the harvest for more than a month and 17 are on the way. The latter are those that are arriving by railway or are being transferred from one oblast to another.

Each battalion contains 500 vehicles and up to 1,000 men. They are furnished with everything they need in order to function independently. At present, servicemen have transported more than 3.7 million tons of cargo, including 2.6 million tons of grain.

The condition of the equipment is not cause for reproach. It is completely supplied with gasoline. Drivers are more of a problem, however.

In accordance with the government's decree, the military is allotting one driver for every four trucks and the oblasts ordering the transportation must furnish the rest. But far from all have managed to do this. For example, no problems have arisen in Volgogradskiy. There we have transported 1.3 million tons of cargo, more than half of the entire harvest. But in Saratov Oblast, from which I have just returned, more than 1,000 vehicles have already been standing idle without drivers and without work for more than a month.

[Litovkin] That is a strange situation at the height of the harvest. But perhaps the oblast does not need as many vehicles as the military "forced" on it. Perhaps it is simply unable to provide the drivers. Who determined how much and what is needed? And then if the oblast cannot "digest" such a volume of equipment, perhaps there is sense in transferring the vehicles to where they can be used now.

[Nadolskiy] It is not that easy. The problem is that the leadership of the oblasts, krays, and republics reached an agreement with the USSR Council of Ministers concerning the quantity of machinery and the opportunities for providing them with drivers. The vehicles were allotted according to the requests of oblast soviet and party organs, not at the initiative of the Ministry of Defense.

Moreover, the leadership of Saratov Oblast has categorically refused our requests to transfer the battalions to those areas that are in great need of them. The matter has gone as far as statements like, "If even one battalion leaves, we refuse to accept any responsibility for the fate of the harvest!"

But the idling of thousands of vehicles, taking into consideration their transportation by railway from the Odessa Military District, has already resulted in losses of 500,000 rubles [R]. And the sum is increasing every day.

[Litovkin] Who will pay for these losses?

[Nadolskiy] What do you mean "who"? The state. Or more accurately those farms, kolkhozes [collective farms], and sovkhozes [state farms] where our vehicles were transferred and which have no work for us.

And the residents of Saratov are not an exception. The same situation is taking place in Kazakhstan. While you were here I received a call from Major General V. Kazantsev, chief of our command group in that republic. He reported that only 50 to 60 percent of the vehicles are being used to transport the harvest in Ural and Aktyubinsk Oblasts. The rest are standing idle; there is no cargo.

The leadership of the republic is well informed of this, but they are nonetheless demanding 10,000 more vehicles from the USSR Council of Ministers. Why? Just in case. And as for the losses, they do not come out of the pocket of those who do the ordering and demand more and more automotive transport.

[Litovkin] Is not the bad weather having an effect on the lack of work?

[Nadolskiy] In this instance the weather has nothing to do with it. Every day we monitor how the vehicles are being used. Some 90 percent of the idle time is due to lack of organization, lack of concern, and to be frank the irresponsibility of the local authorities.

For six months our officers and warrant officers are taken from their families and from the execution of their immediate official duties. They look for work and there is none. The soldiers languish with boredom. And of course all that affects discipline. But those who are supposed to see this and react to it are not resolving the problem.

This is the third year in a row that I have led a vehicle battalion, and I see that the situation is not changing. And it will not change so long as the administrative and bureaucratic system only fights with words and not economic methods. Everything will stay the old way so long as the soviet and party leaders who make the decisions and do the ordering continue to virtually "beat the drum" for transportation and then do not provide it with work and are not financially accountable.

[Litovkin] But why does the military put up with such an outrage? Why are the government and the USSR Supreme Soviet not informed of this?

[Nadolskiy] We have repeatedly appealed to all the highest offices. We proposed ending the practice of allotting military transportation to convey the harvest, or at least cutting it in half. We gave arguments and figures, for example the following data.

Last year 37,000 vehicles lost 330,000 vehicle-days—without considering weather—because of a lack of work. This year more than 1,235 vehicles are already at a standstill for the same reasons. Expenditures on the operation of one motor transport battalion cost the state R1.2 to R1.4 million. This is two to three times more expensive than transporting the harvest using local transportation.

Experience shows that many farms can do very well without our help. And today more than 20 percent of the sovkhozes, kolkhozes, rayons, and oblasts are refusing our services.

We need the application of common sense and healthy economic relations in society and in the countryside. Harvest policy should be determined by the ruble, not by official dictate. That is the whole secret.

Scientific

Cosmonauts Conduct Further Experiments on 'Mir'

LD0709110890 Moscow TASS in English 1059 GMT 7 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow September 7 TASS—Soviet cosmonauts Gennadiy Manakov and Gennadiy Strekalov, on a space flight aboard the Mir station, have been conducting technological and technical experiments and astrophysical and geophysical studies for the past few days.

They also carried out regular work to replace cells in onboard equipment with new ones, delivered by the unmanned cargo craft progress M-4.

Preparing for a smelting experiment on the Gallar installation, Manakov and Strekalov measure temperature patterns in its electric furnace to determine optimal modes for manufacturing high-quality semiconductors in zero gravity.

Today the crew plans to conduct a series of experiments to study the effect of open space factors on samples of various structural materials and to do preventive maintenance work on some of the station's systems.

In the evening, the cosmonauts plan another correction of Mir's orbit, using the engines of the cargo craft.

The flight is proceeding on schedule. The cosmonauts are feeling well.

'Resurs-F' Earth Satellite Launched 7 Sep

LD0809104790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Sep 90 First Edition p 3

[Report: "'Resurs-F' Launched"]

[Text] In the Soviet Union yesterday the latest Resurs-F artificial earth satellite was launched by a Soyuz rocket.

On board is equipment designed for vari-scaled [rasnomasshtabnyy], multizonal, and spectrozonal photography aimed at continuing the investigation of the earth's natural resources—in the interests, of course, of various branches of the national economy—and at performing tasks to do with ecology and international cooperation.

The satellite was placed in orbit with the following parameters:
initial period of orbit [obrashcheniye]—88.8 minutes;
maximum distance from the earth's surface (apogee)—267 km;
minimum distance from the earth's surface (perigee)—193 km;
orbital inclination—82.6 degrees.

The apparatus installed on the satellite is functioning normally.

On completion of the satellite's flight, the exposed film will be sent to the Priroda state research and production center for processing and subsequent dissemination. By the way, in line with a commercial agreement the Resurs-F satellite also carries scientific equipment from the FRG for conducting biotechnological experiments in conditions of microgravity.

Military

Shlyaga Interviewed on Politics in the Military

PM0709135190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 7 Sep 90 First Edition p 1

[Interview with Colonel General N.I. Shlyaga, member of the CPSU Central Committee and chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, by TASS correspondent M. Zakharchuk: "What the Political Organs Will Be Like"—first paragraph is introduction]

[Text] The press has published the USSR president's decree "On Reforming the Political Organs of the USSR Armed Forces, the USSR KGB Troops, the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Internal Troops, and the Railroad Troops." TASS correspondent M. Zakharchuk talks with Colonel General N.I. Shlyaga, member of the CPSU Central Committee and chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, about what measures will be taken in connection with this decree.

[Zakharchuk] Nikolay Ivanovich, the idea of separating state and party functions has long had a grip on our society....

[Shlyaga] Yes, it emerged almost at the beginning of perestroyka. It was powerfully developed at the third extraordinary congress of USSR people's deputies and at the 28th CPSU Congress. It is a natural and logical process connected primarily with our party's resolute renewal.

[Zakharchuk] In other words the president's decree was no surprise to the Main Political Directorate?

[Shlyaga] Of course not. The Main Political Directorate took part in the preparation of the draft of the USSR president's decree. The reorganization of the present institutions of the political organs, which I should note stood the country and the Army in good stead especially during the civil war and the Great Patriotic War, has been thought out by us in the most general outlines. A working group has now elaborated the concept of the new political organs. The troops are already familiarizing themselves with it. It will be discussed at all levels and in the most thorough manner, which in general is natural.

In our view the reorganization of the political organs could be conducted gradually by first shifting the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate to the new structure, and plans and normative documents could be elaborated for the transition of all other political organs to new staffs. Then we could transfer the V.I. Lenin military-political academy, academies, and political personnel courses to the new plans and programs for training political cadres. Next we would transfer all Army and Navy political organs to the new structures and conduct a complex of measures to establish them, completing this stage with the elaboration or detailing of operational mobilization documents in all structures of the military-political organs. So that an enormous amount of work lies ahead.

It is planned to have military-political organs in the majority of those military formations where political organs exist at present. It is planned that the military-political organs will be created by the USSR president at the representation of the USSR defense minister or chief of the Main Political Directorate.

[Zakharchuk] Could you say, if only in general outline, what the renewed political organs will be like?

[Shlyaga] Above all the functions of the political organs and party organizations will be demarcated. The military-political organs up to and including the Main Military-Political Directorate will receive the status of state organs. Their activity should now be based on the officially adopted state policy in the field of defense and security, and on constitutional legislation, and implemented in accordance with the military reform processes which are developing. That is on the one hand. And on the other, the party organs—from regiment party committee to the supreme party organ of the Armed Forces, the all-Army party conference—will be elected. At the regiment and military training establishment level it is planned to retain the institution of deputy commanders for the political section. In connection with reforming measures the system for training political cadres which exists at present will be reviewed.

[Zakharchuk] What range of tasks is planned for the new military-political organs?

[Shlyaga] They will cease to lead the party and Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] organizations and concentrate their efforts on political education, ideological work, cultural and enlightenment activity, the consolidation of military discipline, and political and military information—including foreign information—and will set up sociological and psychological services in the military collectives. The main thing is to educate the personnel in a spirit of selfless devotion to their people and of personal responsibility for the defense of the socialist fatherland as well as of fulfillment of their military duty.

The solution of these tasks, which provide for the consolidation of ties with the servicemen's masses, is closely linked with another task which is a priority one for the military-political organs as they undergo renewal—their transformation into an institute for the social protection of servicemen and the members of their families. Now more than ever we must consider that no calls for awareness will have an effect unless they are based on the relevant "buttresses," on the solution of social problems. That is why the center of all practical political work should be man, the primacy of whose interests and needs should make up the thrust of the transformations which are being implemented.

The future structure of the military-political organs and party, trade union, Komsomol, and other public organizations of the Armed Forces should in our view become more democratic and flexible and accord better with the demand of the political situation which has taken shape in the country and the Army.

I should like to stress once again with particular force that the reorganization of political work is an exceptionally complex and responsible process. On the one hand it touches on the foundations, traditions, and experience of our military building and on the other on the fates of tens of thousands of people. That is why any levity, haste, arbitrary interpretation of existing problems, subjectivism, or scientific and political incompetence—all this can cause irreparable harm to the common cause of the country's defense capability. And that is why every organizational measure and any change or transformation in the complex organism that the political organs represent will take place in an atmosphere of complete glasnost. We will consult with servicemen, scientists, sociologists, psychologists, Communists, and nonparty people.

'Design Defects,' Crew Error Aided Sub Incident

PM0709141190 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 6 Sep 90 Second Edition p 4

["Report of the Government Commission Investigating the Circumstances and Causes of the Foundering of the Submarine Komsomolets"]

[Text] The government commission has completed its investigation into the circumstances and causes of the foundering of the nuclear submarine Komsomolets in the Norwegian Sea on 7 April 1989.

During the commission's work, USSR Defense Ministry and industrial specialists conducted numerous studies and experiments, including some in conditions as near to the actual ones as possible, and studied and took into account suggestions that the commission received from various organizations, citizens, and press publications.

As a result of the investigation it has been established that the catastrophe was caused by a fire in the submarine's aft section. Most probably it was caused by a fire in the electrical equipment. As a result of the high temperature, compressed-air pipes ruptured which increased the intensity of the fire. The effect of the fire and gas spread to other compartments and water began to enter the hull through burned-out seals, causing the submarine to founder.

In the struggle to save the submarine the crew showed selflessness and courage but in the situation that existed it proved impossible to save the submarine. The outcome of the accident was influenced by design defects in individual systems and installations as well as crew errors, particularly in the use of escape systems.

As a result of the commission's work, decisions have been adopted on increasing the reliability of equipment, improving escape systems, and enhancing personnel's professional training. The question of salvaging the wrecked submarine as soon as possible is being studied at the moment.

The radiation level in the area where the submarine went down continues to be monitored and does not exceed the natural background level.

Letter From Defense Industry Deplores Disarray

PM0709101790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Sep 90 Second Edition p 2

["Letter to Newspaper" from directors of defense industry enterprises: "Status for the Defense Industry"]

[Text] To A. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, USSR people's deputies, and Union republic Supreme Soviets

Esteemed Comrades! We leaders of associations, enterprises, and organizations in the defense complex are worried by the grave economic and social situation in the country whose negative consequences are increasingly gripping our enterprises. The defense complex was created by the whole people, sometimes to the detriment of their own prosperity, in order to ensure a vitally important state task—the country's defense capability.

As a result the system that has been created for carrying out basic scientific research and experimental work; the well oiled series production; and the established collectives of highly qualified scientists, engineering and technical personnel, and workers make it possible to provide

all branches of the USSR Armed Forces with modern weapons and combat equipment.

Defense enterprises have always had stable and high growth rates for both defense and civilian output. The 1988 and 1989 plans were fulfilled by all sectors and for the defense complex as a whole, and above-plan output running into billions of rubles [R], including over R600 million in nonfood consumer goods, has been produced each year.

Even now, when most industrial sectors have lowered production volumes, enterprises in the defense complex increased production of nonfood consumer goods by almost one-fourth during the first half-year.

However, the enterprises' stable economic activity is being increasingly disrupted. Plan regulation of the economy has been destroyed and the management system of the complex is being constantly tinkered with. A number of statutes, of USSR laws, and of government resolutions—including the resolution on demonopolization—are directly aimed at destabilizing our complex. The unjustified gap between the remuneration of personnel of state and cooperative enterprises has resulted in massive losses of skilled cadres. Mechanisms for the management of market relations have not been created. Disproportions in production and material and technical supply, and the destruction of established production sharing ties, are creating a critical situation that is getting out of control.

The third quarter is ending, but enterprises have no clear prospects for 1991 with regard to either the production of defense equipment or material and technical supply. Considerable numbers of suppliers are arbitrarily hiking the prices of their output and goods. Monstrous forms of the extortion of scarce goods from consumer enterprises by suppliers of raw and other materials, equipment, and subassemblies; payment for supplies in convertible currency; and the transfer of economic incentive funds are becoming increasingly widespread.

All this is taking place against the background of destructive criticism and attacks on the defense sector as well as attempts by authorities at all levels to interfere in the management of defense enterprises. In some cases the need at all for the country's defense complex in present conditions is being called into question.

A situation has emerged in which our enterprises are forced to prove the need for their existence whereas abroad—especially in the United States, Britain, and France—paramount attention is paid to the defense complex, its improvement, and financial and material and technical support for it despite the steps to reduce armaments. We think that such different situations are not conducive to preserving strategic parity between the USSR and the United States.

We believe that despite the considerable warming of the international climate, in order to maintain an adequate defense capability for the country—especially in conditions of deep conversion—it is necessary to preserve existing intersectorial collaboration, the centralized allocation of material and technical supplies, and state financing of scientific research work on defense topics and to provide appropriate material incentives for labor collectives.

The existing structure of defense ministries accords with the demands of management at the state, sector, and enterprise levels and is capable of functioning effectively even in conditions of a regulated market economy, at least during its most complex initial transitional stage.

The further development of enterprises' autonomy and the resolution of highly important national economic tasks in producing goods for the people and other peaceful output within the framework of conversion must be combined with a centralized system for the management of defense programs.

The resolution of these tasks and a definition of the status of defense enterprises and of their management structure must be reflected in the Union Treaty; in USSR laws "On Defense," "On the State Defense Enterprise," and "On the Conversion of Military Production"; and in an arms program whose speediest elaboration and adoption is a most vital need. For their part personnel of the defense complex will make every effort to fulfill their tasks.

We ask you to examine our proposals at the Fourth USSR Supreme Soviet Session and to adopt appropriate decisions.

[Signed] From the USSR Ministry of the Aviation Industry: R. Belyakov, general designer and academician, Moscow A.I. Mikoyan Machine Building Plant; General Directors A. Manuyev of the Moscow P.V. Dementyev Aviation Production Association, M. Nagibin of the Rostov Helicopter Production Association, A. Napolnov of the Moscow V.V. Chernyshev Machine Building Production Association, I. Rumyantsev of the Moscow "Znamya Revolyutsii" Machine Building Production Association, B. Stepnov of the "Ramenskiy Priborostroitelnyy Zavod" Production Association, and R. Shalin of the "VIAM" Science and Production Association.

From the USSR Ministry of Atomic Energy and Industry: General Directors N. Mironov of the "Molniya" Machine Building Plant Production Association and V. Yarovoy of the "Dvigatel" State Union Plant Production Association; Directors L. Kuznetsov of the Uralsk Electromechanical Plant, V. Kryukov of the Moscow Polymetals Plant, S. Pokrovskiy of the Priargunsk Mining and Chemical Combine, and G. Khandorin of the Siberian Chemical Combine.

From the USSR Ministry of the Defense Industry: General Directors A. Lobov of the "Pavlogradskiy Khimzavod" Production Association, B. Galushchak of the "Novosibirskiy Priborostroitelnyy Zavod" Production

Association, A. Shipunov of the "Tochnost" Science and Production Association, E. Novokhatko of the "Luganskiy Stankostroitelnyy Zavod" Production Association, D. Sergeyev of "LOMO," P. Zyl of "BeLOMO," A. Zhuravlev of the "Izhstal" Production Association, O. Filippov of the Zelenodolsk "Zavod im. Sergo" Production Association, A. Goyev of the "Krasnogorskiy Zavod im. Zvereva" Production Association, and I. Isakhanov of the "Arsenal" Production Association; Director P. Kulagin of the Barnaul Machine Tool Building Plant.

From the USSR Ministry of General Machine Building: General Designers V. Lapygin of the Automation Equipment and Instrument Making Science and Production Association and Yu. Semenov of the "Energiya" Science and Production Association; Director A. Kiselev of the Khrunichev Plant.

From the USSR Ministry of the Radio Industry: General Directors Yu. Badalov of the "Antey" Science and Production Association, Yu. Minayev of the "Skala" Science and Production Association, N. Mikhaylov of the "Vympel" Central Science and Production Association, K. Agafonov of the "SVT" Science and Production Association, and A. Shulunov of the Pleshakov Science and Production Association.

From the USSR Ministry of the Shipbuilding Industry: General Directors P. Belyy of the "Zavod im. Leninskogo Komsomola" Production Association, N. Zhakov of the "Zavod 'Krasnoye Sormovo'" Production Association, V. Krasnov of the "Kometa" Production Association, and V. Pryakhin of the "Kaluzhskiy Turbinnyy Zavod" Production Association; Director I. Ovdiyenko of the Shipbuilding Plant named for the 61 Communards.

From the USSR Ministry of Communications: General Directors O. Burdenko of the Production Association named for the 60th anniversary of October, B. Zolotov of the Komintern Science and Production Association, A. Likhomanov of the "Avtomatika" Science and Production Association, A. Gubenko of the "Kommutator" Production Association, and L. Stukalov of the "Iskra" Production Association.

From the USSR Ministry of the Electronics Industry: General Directors S. Bulgakov of the "Mikroelektronika" Science and Production Association, V. Lapshin of the "MELZ" Production Association, V. Mamedov of the "Fonon" Science and Production Association, and Yu. Dyakov of the "Nauchnyy Tsentr" Science and Production Association.

Celebrations Held in Honor of Tank Troops

Moiseyev Attends Ceremony

PM1009095790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 9 Sep 90 First Edition p 1

[Report: "In Honor of Tank Troops Day"]

[Text] A ceremonial meeting of the Moscow public and of servicemen of the capital's garrison devoted to Tank Troops Day was held in the Red Banner Hall of the M.V. Frunze Central House of the Soviet Army 7 September. The meeting was opened by Colonel General N. Moiseyev, member of the Military Council and chief of the Ground Forces Political Directorate.

Representatives of the capital's working people greeted the tank troop servicemen.

The meeting was addressed by Col. Gen. A. Galkin, chief of the USSR Defense Ministry's Main Armored Directorate.

Participating in the ceremonial meeting were Army General K. Kochetov, USSR first deputy defense minister; Col. Gen. N. Shlyaga, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate; Army General V. Varennikov, commander in chief of Ground Forces and USSR deputy defense minister; Army General V. Shabanov, USSR deputy defense minister; Marshals of the Soviet Union S. Sokolov and V. Kulikov; and generals, officers of the capital's garrison, and tank troop veterans.

Yazov Issues Order

PM1009095990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 9 Sep 90 First Edition p 1

["USSR Defense Minister Order of the Day No. 349" dated Moscow, 9 September 1990]

[Text] Comrade soldiers and sailors, sergeants and petty officers!

Comrade ensigns and warrant officers!

Comrade officers, generals, and admirals!

Comrade defense industry workers, technicians, engineers, and designers!

Comrade tank troops veterans!

Our country and its Armed Forces are today celebrating Tank Troops Day.

The tank troops are greeting their professional holiday at a crucial stage of perestroyka. Revolutionary changes are taking place in society. The political system is being radically transformed, decisive steps are being taken to improve the economy's health, processes of renewal are under way in the spiritual sphere, and a profound military reform is being implemented in accordance with the principle of defense sufficiency. The new political thinking has made it possible to do away with the confrontational approach in foreign policy. The country has begun preparing the Union treaty which will be the basis for profound transformations in our multinational state.

The 28th CPSU Congress gave a new boost to these processes. Supporting its decisions and the congress resolution "On the Main Areas of the Party's Military

Policy at the Contemporary Stage," tank troop servicemen together with USSR Armed Forces personnel are directing their efforts toward qualitatively resolving the tasks of combat and political training, enhancing combat readiness, strengthening military discipline and organization, and asserting a healthy moral atmosphere in collectives.

I greet and congratulate you on the holiday—Tank Troops Day!

I wish tank troop personnel new successes in enhancing the quality of combat training. I express confidence that by their selfless military labor tank troop servicemen will continue to reliably ensure the state's security and will implement the instructions issued by the USSR president at his meeting with participants in the exercise in Odessa Military District.

I wish defense industry workers successes in labor, in enhancing the quality of armament and military hardware, and in improving production and economic indicators in the name of strengthening the country's defense capability.

I wish tank troops veterans good health and successes in the military-patriotic education of Soviet young people in the spirit of loyalty to military and civic duty.

To mark Tank Troops Day I order:

That festive firework displays be held today, 9 September 1990, at 2200 hours local time in the hero-city of Moscow, capital of our motherland; in the capitals of the Union republics; in the hero-cities of Leningrad, Volgograd, Odessa, Sevastopol, Novorossiysk, Kerch, Tula, Smolensk, and Murmansk; and in the hero-fortress of Brest.

[Signed] Marshal of the Soviet Union D. Yazov, USSR Defense Minister

Baltic Republics

Landsbergis Reviews Problems With Moscow Talks

PM0709133790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent Nikolay Lashkevich: "V. Landsbergis on Talks With the USSR"]

[Text] Vilnius—Following the first sitting of the second session of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet V. Landsbergis held a press conference at which he set forth his position on the problem of talks with the Soviet Union.

As if to counter K. Prunskiene's repeated statements that the talks process is being delayed by parliament, he pinned responsibility for the delay on the Soviet Union. V. Landsbergis noted that Lithuania had prepared carefully for the talks, had set up a mechanism to prepare for them, had repeatedly appealed to the Soviet leadership in the quest for contact, and three weeks ago had presented the Soviet side with a corresponding document which was meant to have been the starting point for talks. However, a reply had still not been received.

To follow this logic, the USSR could earlier, with the same success and with far greater grounds for so doing, have accused Lithuania of delaying the bilateral dialogue, since the state delegation headed by N. Ryzhkov waited a long time for this "negotiating mechanism" to be set up in Lithuania and the seemingly simple question of the formation of a similar state delegation to be resolved. Many prominent politicians in Lithuania believe that the favorable moment for the talks has been lost and with good reason. However, at the press conference the Lithuanian leader cited his arguments, stating that it is not the actual fact of talks that is important, but "talks in which we could win something"—that is, they could not get around the negotiating table before because they were liable to "lose."

V. Landsbergis believes that one of the reasons for the Soviet Union's "reluctance" to conduct talks at the moment is the Soviet leadership's desire to pressure Lithuania to ensure that it takes part in the preparations for and actual signing of a new union treaty. "It would be good," V. Landsbergis said, "if we were able to discuss this draft treaty from the standpoint of an independent state." That, in his opinion, is the precondition whose acceptance could allow Lithuania to take part in the elaboration of a union treaty.

Lithuanian Party Leader on CSCE Participation

LD0709152390 Helsinki Domestic Service in Finnish 0900 GMT 7 Sep 90

[Text] The Baltic states want to have their representatives at the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe [CSCE]. In an appeal issued in Tampere in the name of the Lithuanian Social Democratic Party, an official position is demanded for Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania at the CSCE summit meeting in Paris to be held at the end of the year. Matti Vaeisaenen has interviewed the leader of the Lithuanian Social Democrats in Tampere:

[Vaeisaenen] The chairman of the Lithuanian Social Democratic Party, Kazimieras Antanavicius, who is participating in the Socialist International disarmament conference, is disappointed in the support for the Baltic countries given by the west in their efforts toward independence. When I ask what sort of support the Baltic countries want, then Antanavicius says that the most important form of support would be to invite Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania to take part in the Paris summit meeting of the CSCE as full members. The rest of Europe is looking backward, however, and does not dare help the Baltic nations for fear of the Soviet Union, says Antanavicius.

[Begin Antanavicius recording in English] It is a pity that European countries, European democracies, do not support us, do not see a front. They are seeing only behind, and are afraid of the Soviet Union. [end recording]

[Vaesaeinen] Antanavicius emphasizes that only free nations can change the system based on confrontation that has lasted for 50 years in the Soviet Union. Now these structures are breaking down, says the chairman of the Lithuanian Social Democratic Party. Kazimieras Antanavicius is a professor of economics, a people's deputy, and chairman of the Economics Commission of the Lithuanian parliament. Antanavicius says that the Soviet Union cannot survive as a Union in its present form. People want to get out of the whole system as soon as possible. Only after independence, perhaps in 10, 15 years, some possible union could be considered, as some sort of common market between the present republics, he believes. The declaration of independence of Lithuania made in March was succeeded by a very tense period in relations between Vilnius and Moscow, during which the central government in Moscow tried by such means as an energy blockade to curb Lithuania's strivings for independence. Antanavicius says that tension has clearly eased in recent times, because other things have risen to the surface. These include the struggle for power between Boris Yeltsin and Mikhail Gorbachev, for example. Antanavicius also emphasizes that, in talking of relations with Moscow, a distinction must be made between Yeltsin's Moscow and Gorbachev's Moscow. The political and economic situation has changed, says Antanavicius.

[Begin Antanavicius recording in English] Now, with Yeltsin, with Yeltsin's government, we begin straight, straight agreements, straight contacts, straight links. [end recording]

[Vaeisaenen] So far all important economic matters were firmly channelled through Moscow. But now that Yeltsin has come to power in Russia, Lithuania is concluding direct links and agreements with Russia, bypassing Moscow's supervision. Despite this, these are hard times in Lithuania. There are shortages of almost everything. The

most crucial need is for oil, gas, agricultural chemicals, fodder, and paper, which Lithuania is now starting to make itself. It also aims to start using its own currency at the beginning of next year, says Antanavicius. Of Lithuania's independence process, the Social Democratic Leader Antanavicius says that in the political sense it may be realized in less than a year, but economically it may take 20 years, perhaps.

Lithuanian Group Comments on German Unity

LD0809224190 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 8 Sep 90

[Text] The coordinating group of Lithuania's political parties, organizations, and movements has issued a statement in connection with the forthcoming meeting of the winners in World War II on the German issue in Moscow on 12 September. The statement expresses concern over the fact that the unification of Germany may be recognized as the final elimination of the consequences of World War II. In this case the issue of the Baltic countries' statehood will be reduced to an internal problem of the Soviet Union. With a view to attracting the world's attention to the Baltics' independence problem, Lithuania's political parties, organizations, and movements are staging different actions timed with the Moscow meeting. An appeal to the leaders of the USA, Britain, France, and the Soviet Union has been prepared which emphasizes that determining the fate of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia without their participation is unlawful and dishonorable.

Vilnius Garrison Officers Issue Appeal

LD0709164390 Vilnius Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 7 Sep 90

[Text] An appeal by a group of officers from Vilnius garrison was published in today's issue of the newspaper SOGLASIYE [published in Vilnius in Russian by Sajudis].

"We are concerned about the uncertainty and ambiguity of our position", the statement reads. "While recognizing the declaration about the state independence of republics, including the act adopted by the Supreme Council of Lithuania on 11 March, we are concerned that military forces could be used other than according to their designated function. High-ranking military bureaucrats are not willing to loose their privileges, thus we believe they do not have a clear and scientifically based concept of restructuring in the armed forces", reads the appeal by a group of officers from the Vilnius garrison published in today's issue of the newspaper SOGLASIYE.

Lithuania Criticizes U.S. Media Coverage

LD0909180890 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 8 Sep 90

[Text] As the six-month anniversary of Lithuania's declaration restoring independence draws near, Radio Vilnius correspondent Jonas Budrys has this commentary about the role of the media during the last half year.

[Budrys] Lithuania fast approaches the half-year anniversary of its declaration to restore independence. It was a declaration which stunned the Western world. It was a declaration that impressed the Western world. It was a declaration that heaped unprecedented media attention on the small Baltic nation, which the majority of Americans at least had never heard of before. It was a declaration however which, despite the limelight it created, did little to enlist real support for Lithuania.

In a shameful display of cowardice and ignorance, Western governments, one by one, closed their hearts and then their eyes as Moscow reached into its bag of well-rehearsed actors and gave them to the West disguised as journalists, consultants, and political analysts. Unfortunately for the Lithuanians, the last six months have been a media war fought behind Kremlin lines and won by Moscow. After 11 March harried Western journalists and television reporters raced through Vilnius for several weeks without sleep, trying to beat one another to the morning front pages or the supper-hour newscast. They tried in a few panicked hours to piece together 50 years of history and spit it back to an uninformed American public in between television commercials for dog food and full page ads for McDonald's latest hamburger. While at the same time the Kremlin's smoothest characters moved through the United States media like debutantes, planting parallels between Lithuania's leap to freedom and the American civil war. They asked: What do you think the President would do if California decided to secede from the union? They called the Soviet occupation of the Baltics a marriage instead of a rape and made absurd comparisons with Quebec and Greater Canada. They called Lithuania the rebellious republic, the breakaway nation, the maverick country, and with the subtlety of language that will prejudice judgment, cast Lithuania as the stick in the eye of monumental democratic change in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. They constructed for the West a make-believe choice—it can be Gorbachev or Lithuania, one or the other.

World-class dazzlers such a Gennadiy Gerasimov and Vladimir Posner laid into a gullible and naive audience, and the newspapers bought it, and the television networks bought it and ultimately, like children who don't want believe in the bogey man, the American public bought it. They bought it hook, they bought it line, they bought it sinker. In one national American newspaper an opinion poll among readers asked: Would you support Lithuania if it meant jeopardizing the sweeping changes already made in Eastern Europe? The backroom in the

Kremlin must have roared in laughter; it could not have written a more loaded question themselves.

After foreign journalists were expelled from Lithuania, not a single major American publication looked at this expulsion as an outrageous insult to the trade of journalism. Not one latched onto this as an insight into the real story. Not one hit at it day after day as something that must never be tolerated by the American press. They reacted in this way because in the United States at least, news is primarily an entertainment medium, something literally sandwiched in between advertisements. Televised news in particular is fundamentally no different than soap operas, baseball games, or made-for-TV movies. Their purpose is to sell products for the companies who pay for the air time. The news is not exempt from this mandate. It is that simple, it is that frightening, and it is why that when no journalists were massed in Vilnius, after they were all expelled, but the story was still hot, was still a seller, had product appeal, the American media got much of its information straight from TASS in Moscow. The news from Lithuania came to us via Red Square.

On the eve of independence negotiations with Moscow, talks which will take place in that same neighborhood, I am afraid we are in for quite literally a repeat performance.

Lithuanian Council Delegation Leaves for Poland

LD0709165890 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1300 GMT 7 Sep 90

[Text] A 12-member Lithuanian Supreme Council delegation, led by Supreme Council Foreign Commission Chairman Emanuelis Zingeris departed for the Polish Republic today.

The Lithuanian republic's parliamentarians will meet with members of the Polish Republic Sejm Foreign Affairs Commission and representatives of the Foreign Ministry.

During the course of the Warsaw meeting it is planned to exchange opinions concerning the situation in Europe prior to the start of the Paris conference, and to discuss other questions of interest to the Lithuanian and Polish republics. The visit to Poland will last two days.

Civil Defense Exercise for Lithuania Planned

LD0609205390 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1900 GMT 6 Sep 90

[Text] The leadership of the military district of the Soviet Baltic Republics has announced that civil defense exercises will be held on the territory of the Republic of Lithuania from 8 to 18 September. This has not been coordinated with the government of the Republic of Lithuania.

According to the plan of the organizers, the republican and city civil defense headquarters must take part in the exercises.

The government of the Republic of Lithuania does not support the decision made by the leadership of the Baltic Military District and instruct the subjects of the economic installations of the republic not to take part in these exercises.

Lithuania Denies Part in Republic Economic Pact

LD0609222790 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 6 Sep 90

[Text] Algirdas Brazauskas, deputy prime minister of Lithuania, has told Radio Vilnius that the Lithuanian government is not participating in the working out of the draft economic agreement between the Soviet republics.

Several days ago Radio Vilnius received from an undisclosed source in Moscow a copy of a document stating that the aforementioned draft agreement had been coordinated with all republics with a single exception of Estonia. The document is addressed to Mikhail Gorbachev and signed by Mr. Shatalin, a well- known Soviet economist.

Algirdas Brazauskas explained that an expert in economy from Lithuania had participated in one of the meetings in Moscow. However, he was not an official representative and did not sign anything. They included an observer into the number of official participants, said Algirdas Brazauskas in conclusion to Radio Vilnius.

Possibility of KGB in Lithuania Discussed

LD0609201990 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 0000 5 Sep 90

[Text] Mercys Laurinkus, chief of the Lithuanian security department, said in an interview for the newspaper REPUBLIC that realistic possibilities for negotiations concerning the status of the KGB in Lithuania had been created by the establishment of this department.

Having pointed out that there is no point in confrontation with the KGB unit in Lithuania, he also pointed out that the department of security cannot ignore the activities of the KGB agencies—and not only the KGB—at various institutions of the state of Lithuania. He did not specify what the other agencies were.

According to M. Laurinkus, there are people willing to work in the department—mostly young people—from the KGB, and he does not decline such a possibility.

The present chief of the Lithuanian KGB General Mercinkus was characterised by M. Laurinkus as professional, tactful, and a man of great erudition; however, at the same time he pointed out that the KGB department here in Lithuania is not a simple one and probably it is not easy for General Marcinkus to manage it.

Plans of Latvian Political Parties Outlined

LD0809103590 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 7 Sep 90

[Report by Martens Gravitas in Riga]

[Text] Latvian Parliament Chairman Anatolijs Gorbunovs has announced this week he leaves the independent Communist Party. The reason for that is his willingness to become a better and absolutely unbiased mediator between different parties and their representatives in the parliament.

After the split in Latvia's Communist Party this spring the independent Communist Party now has about 20,000 members, most of them Latvians, while the pro-Moscow faction has 300,000 most of them non-Latvians and those who migrated to Latvia after year 1940 when Latvia was annexed by the Soviet Union. The independent Communist Party has announced it stands for market economy and democracy. It holds a congress in a few weeks' time where it is expected it is going to change its name from the Independent Communists to Democratic Labor.

A delegation of leaders of the Socialist International arrive in Latvia on Sunday to investigate the situation with the split within the Latvian Social Democratic Party. It renewed its work only a year ago after it had been banned for more than 50 years. The conflict arose this spring during parliament elections (?while) one of its factions refused to vote for democratically minded communists. The visit is evidently connected with the problem of who of the existing social democratic parties in Latvia now functioning today in Latvia has the right to again occupy the seat in the Socialist International which has been kept (?waiting) for the last 50 years.

Latvian-RSFSR Draft Treaty Prepared

LD0709174190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1225 GMT 7 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Galina Kuchina]

[Text] Riga, 7 Sep (TASS)—The draft treaty on the main principles for relations between this Baltic Republic and the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] has been distributed to deputies of the Latvian Supreme Council. Until yesterday its content was known only to the commissions of both sides which held two rounds of meetings in August. The document is now to be discussed and if it is signed and ratified by the parliaments of both republics, it will come into force.

The first two articles will contain an acknowledgement of Lavia as independent and the RSFSR as a sovereign state and as subjects of international law as was proclaimed by the declarations of the two republics. "If the occupation of Latvia was registered, this would have been our maximum achievement," this is how Valentina Zeyle, a member of the Latvian delegation commented on the course of talks. "But the issue of the evaluation of past events was withdrawn, a lack of desire on Russia's part to undertake any kind of obligations here was felt." In her words, "support by Russia for Latvian independence would be a big plus at talks with the USSR."

In other articles of the draft, the full completeness of the legislative, executive, and judicial power of the republics on their own territories was consolidated. The necessity for the creation of a single system for ecological safety was stressed. The exchange of diplomatic, consular, and trade representatives is envisaged. It is planned to regulate many issues by special agreements. These need to be elaborated right now.

The draft law met with varied responses in the Latvian parliament. Opinions are being expressed that it is unlikely that it will be ratified. It does not suit a number of radicals who do not accept any compromises with the "former mother country". The document causes particular anxiety amongst members of the "equal rights" [ravnopraviye] faction—59 deputies out of 200. They have decided to appeal directly to the Russian parliamentarians in connection with the laws prepared by the republic which discriminate against the non-indigenous populations. In the letter prepared for publication at a press conference in Moscow or in the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, they report the fact that the faction is being deprived of the opportunity to oppose the anti-democratic draft law on citizenship. The deputies request that their Russian colleagues do not ratify the treaty until this law is adopted. Representatives of the Center for Democratic Initiatives [Tsentr Demokraticheskikh Initsiativ] a public organization in Latvia which comes out in favor of giving priority to universal human values—are to picket the building of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet on Monday with this request. A group of delegates from the center as well as a number of deputies from the "equal rights" faction leave for Moscow today.

Pact's Ratification 'Unlikely'

PM1009153790 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 8 Sep 90 Second Edition p 5

[Report bt TASS correspondent G. Kuchina: "Is the Treaty to be Like This?"]

[Text] Riga, 7 Sep—Latvian Supreme Soviet deputies have received the draft treaty on the basic principles of relations between the republic and the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic]. Its content was known only to the two sides' commissions, which held two rounds of meetings in August. Now the document will be discussed. If ratified, it will go into force.

The first two articles recognize Latvia as an independent state and the RSFSR as a sovereign state, both subjects of international law as proclaimed by the two republics' declarations. "Had the occupation of Latvia been registered here, that would have been our greatest achievement," V. Zeyle, member of the Latvian delegation, said, commenting on the course of the talks. "But the question of evaluating past events was taken off the agenda as it

was apparent that Russia was unwilling to assume any commitments." In his words, Russia's support for Latvia's independence would be a great bonus at the talks with the USSR.

Other articles in the draft enshrine the full range of legislative, executive, and judicial power on the respective territories. The need for the creation of a uniform system of environmental safety is stressed. There is a provision for the exchange of diplomatic, consular, and trade representatives. Many questions are due to be settled by special agreements which are to be elaborated. For example, on the procedure for the resettlement of people, the border regime, and economic and information cooperation.

In the opinion of a number of deputies the document abounds in commonplaces and is disappointing. But even in its present form it displeases some radicals, who will accept no compromise with the "former motherland." It is thought that the document is unlikely to be ratified.

Special concern is expressed by members of the "Equal Rights" group. They represent the interests of a large part of the indigenous population but were not involved in the elaboration of the treaty. They were alarmed by the section of the document which defined the choice of citizenship according to the legislation of the country of residence. Aware of the different laws that are planned and discriminatory measures that are proposed, the "Equal Rights" deputies decided to make a direct appeal to Russia's parliamentarians.

In a letter to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet they state that the group has been deprived of the possibility of opposing the undemocratic law on citizenship. The deputies ask their Russian colleagues not to ratify the treaty before the adoption of the law.

Secrecy Broken

PM0609153990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent Irina Litvinova: "Treaty With RSFSR on the Agenda"]

[Text] Riga—The Latvian Supreme Soviet resumed work after the parliamentary recess on 3 September.

One of the questions which deputies have to debate is the draft treaty between Latvia and Russia.

According to the LATVIAN NEWS AGENCY A. Krastins, leader of the Latvian delegation at the talks and deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet, reported that the signing of the treaty is being deferred until mid-September. According to him, this is related not to the results of the meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and Boris Yeltsin but only to the fact that the draft document has not yet been discussed in the Russian Parliament's Constitutional Committee.

The text of the document has hitherto been shrouded in some secrecy in Latvia. The other day a report that the "treaty with Russia will be discussed in the absence of the press" appeared in the local press. All the more unexpected therefore was the interview with Deputy Valentina Zejle, one of the five members of the Latvian delegation at the talks (they all represent the People's Front faction) in the newspaper LATVIJAS JAUNATNE, where she described the details of the talks in Moscow and Riga. The Latvian draft taken to Moscow at the start of August was based on recognition of the Latvian-Russian peace treaty of 11 August 1920 and the declarations on state sovereignty made by the two republics that year. Latvia considered that the Russian city of Pytalovo should fall within its borders again. In Deputy Zejle's opinion, when the Russian delegation brought its version of the draft to Riga 10 days ago it did not contain many features which the Latvian side would wish to enshrine: "The question of assessments of the past has somehow disappeared."

The basic points of disagreement were cited. Latvia, for example, wanted to reflect the fact that all personal property and real estate on its territory belongs to it. The Russian delegation had doubts on this score, particularly with regard to Union property—enterprises, railroads, aircraft, and so forth. The delegations' approaches to the problem of citizenship, which so worry inhabitants belonging to the nonindigenous population, also became known for the first time. "They agreed that there will be an opportunity to choose, but only the citizenship of one state."

The Latvian delegation representative also named those issues on which they were unanimous. The republics will not, for example, put obstacles in the way of each other's transit operations—shipments via ports, railroad transportation, and air transport. The procedure proposed by Latvia on the question of guarding the borders and customs organization was, according to Zejle, accepted: Both sides operate independently and autonomously and conclude agreements where necessary.

Latvian Draft Law on Citizenship Demanded

PM1009151590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Sep 90 Second Edition p 4

["Commentary on Event" by correspondent O. Meshkov: "Strangers in One's Own Home"]

[Text] Riga—An unusual delegation has left Riga for Moscow. It comprises people's deputies of the Latvian Republic and representatives of the Democratic Initiative Center. They intend to hand to deputies of the Russian parliament an appeal not to give their consent to the signing of a treaty between the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] and Latvia until a just law on citizenship has been adopted in the Latvian Republic.

The question of citizenship for permanent residents of the Latvian Republic really is a very important problem

now. It is to be resolved at the fall session of the Supreme Soviet when the draft law on citizenship is examined. There are three concepts of citizenship, but none of them can fully satisfy the republic's nonindigenous inhabitants, who, I will remind you, make up approximately 50 percent of the population here. The discriminatory nature of the proposed concepts is manifested in the fact that even the most liberal of them provides for the rejection of USSR citizenship in favor of republican citizenship.

Those who for one reason or another do not wish to register as citizens of the Latvian Republic will be turned into foreign citizens and will lose the right to vote in election for the republic's state authority—after which its Supreme Soviet can be dissolved and new elections will be scheduled, in which only registered citizens of the Latvian Republic will be able to participate.

However, the matter is not confined to political discrimination. Discrimination is also provided for in the economic sphere: For example, a permament resident of Latvia who has not become a citizen of the republic will not be able to gain private ownership of land.

And so the delegation members have gone to the Russian parliamentarians in Moscow. The RSFSR Declaration of State Sovereignty inspires hope in the possibility of a positive solution to the problem. Point 11 of the declaration states: "RSFSR citizens outside the republic are under the protection and patronage of the RSFSR." How is this to be implemented in reality?

Here is the viewpoint of M. Gavrilov, people's deputy of the Latvian Republic:

"It seems that RSFSR citizens outside the republic are under the RSFSR's protection only if the RSFSR agrees in the treaty with the Latvian Republic their identical rights with those of citizens of the Latvian Republic, i.e. if it ensures that RSFSR citizens in Latvia are also citizens of the Latvian Republic. Otherwise it will have to be admitted that the RSFSR agrees with the degraded position of its compatriots in a friendly state."

For example, if the RSFSR does not uphold the right of its compatriots to participate in elections of Latvian state organs, does this not mean the organization of elections to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet on the territory of Latvia for the RSFSR citizens who live there? Yet RSFSR citizens outside the RSFSR cannot participate in any elections. But does the holding of such elections on Latvia's territory not mean a violation of its sovereignty?

Similar questions are arising in both the economic and the social spheres. Of course it is possible to resolve the problem by proposing that such people leave Latvia, but what if every union state does this? Is the tragic experience of the Armenian-Azerbaijani resettlement really not enough.

Latvia's Current Political Situation Assessed

90UN2743A Moscow TRUD in Russian 28 Aug 90 p 2

[Article by G. Lapinya under the rubric "Radicals and Moderates—Search for Agreement": "Latvia: Parliament is on Holiday, But..."]

[Text] Latvia's parliamentarians are on vacation—a short respite between three months of heated work and the beginning of the next session of the Supreme Soviet, which is designated for 3 September. This short break in the parliament's activities is useful and, probably, should be used for understanding its lessons.

As Anatolijs Gorbunovs, chairman of the Supreme Soviet, noted in the concluding press conference, it would be a mistake to expect any obvious successes from the recently elected and "contentious" parliament—it needs time to "get settled."

Undoubtedly these three months have exposed many internal problems in the Supreme Soviet, but they have also contributed to the development of relations between factions of the People's Front of Latvia [NFL] and factions of the Latvian Communist Party "Equal Rights" [Ravnopraviye] minority: Their leaders have acknowledged that constructive cooperation between them is possible. Back in May only adherents of the NFL voted in favor of adopting the Declaration of Independence; but at the beginning of August the government's program was approved by a convincing majority of the entire parliament. However, differences remain when deciding individual issues, especially political ones.

The government's program, which defines long-term development of the national economy of the republic, warrants special attention. It is the first time in postwar years that the Supreme Soviet has discussed such a document. However it includes many terms related to the transition to a market economy which are unclear and almost unknown to our citizens and are therefore frightening. For example, privatization of approximately one-third of our national wealth. What does that mean in the real life of a specific citizen? What does it promise him? There are also many questions in connection with the declaration of a variety of forms of ownership, never mind with free market prices. "How can it get any freer!" is what visitors will say to themselves at a kolkhoz [collective farm] market or commercial store where a mere mortal can get a look at high-demand items that are inaccessible to him...

It is difficult to believe in creeping unemployment when the newspapers continue to print employment advertisements. But the government has calculated that there are currently about 30,000 open jobs in the republic. Nonetheless, the program does not exclude the possibility of the appearance of 23,000-48,000 unemployed. And according to data published in the trade union newspaper ARODS, there are already about 3,000 people who cannot find work in their specialty. Over the last two years more than 34,000 workers have been laid off

because of reductions in staff, reorganization, and elimination of enterprises. A third version of the Law on Employment of the Population has already been prepared with the participation of the trade unions, but this question, complex and buttressed by many plans, is still entirely unclear.

While approving for the most part the main tendencies of the government's program, Latvia's free trade unions have raised criticism. A number of draft bills concerning social protections for the population have already been reviewed by the parliament. There is provision for a compensatory system in the event that prices increase and the standard of living fluctuates. But in the opinion of the trade unions, more efficient programs are needed for construction of housing, provision of food goods to the population, medical services, and education. Incidentally, A. Silins, chairman of the Union of Free Trade Unions, believes that the government's program should be discussed not only by parliament but by the people as a whole.

The parliament and the government of Latvia are devoting much attention to the development of foreign contacts. Standing ties with its neighbors—Lithuania and Estonia—are encompassing literally all its sectors. And the geography of cooperation is broadening. An official delegation of Latvia met with representatives of the Supreme Soviet of Moldova in Kishinev to make preparations for a bilateral treaty. At the initiative of B. Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, and I. Silayev, chairman of the Council of Ministers, a treaty is being worked out between Latvia and Russia encompassing all spheres of mutually profitable cooperation for 1991 and further prospects. It is assumed that the treaty will be signed at the end of August, and then it should be ratified by the Supreme Soviets of Latvia and the RSFSR. The first round of negotiations, as we reported, took place successfully in Moscow, and the second, timed to coincide with the 70th anniversary of the signing of the treaty between Latvia and Russia, took place in Riga.

In addition, the conditions for direct interregional ties were discussed at a meeting in Tallinn between the heads of the governments of the Baltic republics and representatives of the governments of Russia, Belorussia, and Moldova, as well as representatives of the Moscow Soviet, the Leningrad Soviet, and the Leningrad Oblast Soviet.

All these examples convincingly refute the rather widespread opinion to the effect that the independence declared by the Baltic republics presupposes cutting all ties and contacts with the USSR. The Supreme Soviet of Latvia also adopted a decree on negotiations with the USSR (without the advancement of any sort of preliminary conditions) if the Union acknowledges the fact of the state independence of the Republic of Latvia. Representatives of the Supreme Soviet and the Government of the USSR had a consultative meeting on 21 August with representatives of Latvia. It is still too early to talk about results—both parties spoke in favor of continuing the consultations.

The parliamentary minority faction "Equal Rights" (its representatives were not included in the delegation for negotiations with Moscow for the reason that the opposition had come out against the 4 May Declaration of Independence of the Republic of Latvia) declared its intention to create its own delegation for consultations with the leadership of the USSR and the RSFSR. The Latvian Communist Party Central Committee supported the minority faction and charged its representatives with working out a Communist Party concept for negotiations with the leadership of the RSFSR and other republics. And one of the most novel of Latvia's organizations—the monarchist union—put forward its own demand: that the republic's leadership conduct negotiations only with... "the legal successor of the Russian throne."

In short, pluralism...

As you can see, the parties and political organizations existing in Latvia present a very broad spectrum of opinions. The NFL publication ATMODA published the results of a poll conducted by the newspaper in conjunction with the Latvian association of sociologists and compared figures gathered at the beginning and middle of the year. The graph of the popularity of political and public organizations across the six months did not undergo any changes. But the accents shifted. The "greens" received the highest rating—their popularity grew, as did that of the national cultural associations—the Baltic-Slavic Association and the movement for national independence of Latvia.

The People's Front is already in fourth place. The index of its popularity has fallen across the six months. Why has that happened? According to the opinions of the leaders of the NFL itself, once the organization won the elections "it ate itself up." Its activists became people's deputies at all levels, and that required a regrouping of forces within the People's Front. Its new program and rules will be adopted at the third congress in the autumn. The congress will also probably decide whether the movement needs the status of a political party.

The Latvian Communist Party will also be examining its own draft program and rules (according to the aforementioned poll, its index of popularity also fell). The independent Communist Party is also preparing for its second congress. Both communist parties have finally finished a long and scandalous lawsuit over the party newspaper TSINYA. The Latvian Communist Party prevailed, and the "independents" will have their own press organ. Subscribers who are not content with the content and course of the present newspaper may cancel their subscriptions. According to data from "Soyuzpechat" [Union Press], requests for the return of money are already being received. In order to untie the intricate

knot of relations between the various publishers, publishing houses, and publications, the Council of Ministers has adopted a decree on the creation of an independent, extradepartmental joint-stock society. More than 20 editorial boards have declared their wish to be its founders and have been acknowledged corporate persons. Specialists and the journalists themselves believe that difficult times are ahead for several publications, and it is possible that bankruptcy threatens some...

In conclusion, I would like to return to the issue of popularity. And this time I have in mind organizations which are not showing themselves to their best effect. Such as two parties of Social Democrats who are continuing a scandalous revelation of relations and a congress of citizens who have proclaimed themselves a state structure rather than a public structure, one "possessing the authority" to protest even decrees of the Supreme Soviet. The causes of the confrontation between the congress of citizens of the Republic of Latvia and its Supreme Soviet were the differing approaches to the question of citizenship in the republic and the consequences resulting from it. It is hard not to agree with the evaluation expressed by I. Kozakevich, deputy of the Supreme Soviet: "It is very easy to promote slogans without considering the ethical, political, and economic aspects and the real consequences." The actions of the ultraradicals essentially "work" against democratic processes in the republic. And their ambitions do not have the wide support of the indigenous population.

Thus, the poll is still in favor of the moderates. Thanks to their wisdom, the republic is still managing to avoid an extreme confrontation of political forces. And this confirms the experience of the parliament.

Estonian-USSR Talks in Moscow 'Broken Off'

LD0809004990 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 7 Sep 90

[Interview with Endel Lippma, Estonian special minister to Moscow and member of the Estonian delegation to talks with the USSR, by correspondent Eva Targ; place and date not given—recorded]

[Text] [Announcer] The talks between Estonia and the Soviet Union have broken off. This happened yesterday during the third round of the talks. This is no surprise as Estonia was prepared for any dirty tricks from Moscow. This is also a response to those in Lithuania who have been calling to bring forward the talks with Moscow. It is clear that Moscow is not interested in talks with the Baltic republics. It hasn't yet abandoned the hope to lure these republics into the new Union or confederation. Testifying to this is our correspondent Eva Targ's interview with one of the members of the Estonian delegation at the talks. Here is Tallinn on the line.

[Correspondent Targ] After a promising start of Estonian and Soviet Union talks on Estonia's regaining independence a couple of weeks ago, the talks were suspended this week. I asked Endel Lippma, Estonia's special minister to Moscow and member of Estonian delegaton for talks with the Soviet Union, why it did happen.

[Begin Lippma recording] Well, it was kind of difficult to define precisely why it did happen, but I can certainly describe how it happened. The chairman of the Soviet delegation, Mr. Klitsenko just declared that he actually has no mandate and is not authorized to negotiate at all, although the delegation had been already been [as heard] negotiating three times. We had had three meetings already. And they proposed that only some kind of consultative meetings are possible, which we decided not to agree with but permitted it to go on like that just for yesterday, for one day. And now we must decide what to do next. I think that the situation is such that we need political activity, also about equal intensity in all directions—I mean to the east, to the west, to the north and to the south, meaning Moscow, (all) various Western capitals, Helsinki and Vilnius and Riga. And only if all this goes on in a concerted and coordinated manner can we achieve something positive in Moscow and elsewhere, and of course we must act together, all three—with all other Baltic states, that is, Estonia, Latvia, and first of all, Lithuania—must act together. But intentions have been the same all the time, the same as they were formulated in February. That is, we were proposed a new federation, a renewed federation within a Union treaty. It has also been called confederation or the new Union, or whatever, but a unitary state anyway. That has been the single and only proposal up to now. And on 16 August a departure from this point was made and the Soviet delegation declared to have a mandate to discuss and negotiate anything. Now this promise was retracted yesterday. [end recording]

Estonia Plans Establishment of Armed Forces

LD1009104990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 10 Sep 90

[Text] As TASS correspondent Yurkin has reported, Estonia is setting up its own armed forces. For the time being it has been decided to form two divisions numbering 15,000-16,000 men. In addition to this a border, police, and rescue service are to be formed. The troops' fundamental task has also been determined—it is the registration of conflicts of any kind and the facilitation of diplomatic solutions. This is the position of Rein Tamme, chairman of the Estonian Supreme Soviet defense commission, which was expounded by him at the latest sitting of the Estonian Committee.

To implement the program a police school and college have been set up in the republic and the training of pilots has begun.

Estonian Official Views Defense Organization

LD1009131590 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 0600 GMT 10 Sep 90

[Excerpts] In the near future draft Estonian laws on the defense forces should reach the discussion stage. Perhaps

a question will be raised about how opportune these laws are. Rein Tamme, head of the state defense commission of the Republic of Estonia Supreme Soviet:

[Tamme] [passage omitted] We must have defense forces. What do we understand by this? Defense forces is a wider concept than defense army. The defense forces consist of several component parts, with al those structures—regardless of their departmental relationship—which ensure the protection of an individual. Proceeding from our actual situation, the most essential thing at the moment is to organize border service units. Without order on the border—that is, without taking the border under control, and that also includes economic control—the immigration law, for example, will not be implemented. As far as I understand, our own currency cannot be put into circulation; and there will be no protection of the economy. Consequently, we must start from here, from this component part, from the border protection service.

Rescue services are also essential. We must create such a service for accidents, catastrophes, and the like. And this would also be the right place for the quite alien system of civil defense which exists at the moment.

An essential component part is defense associations at the initiative of citizens. In the future, they must have mass appeal, and be a defense-related association of an already trained population. And in this respect we are keeping in mind the system used by the Swiss confederation.

We must understand that the police service is also a component part of the defense forces, even though it has a different subordination. It is subordinated to the Internal Affairs Ministry and not to the Defense Ministry. But the police service is a structure to protect the Citizen. We must see it as such and we must say clearly that it is a component part of the defense forces. And it is definitely also a component part ready to participate in any possible special situation. We must also foresee such a theoretical situation.

The most essential and central unit of the Defense forces is the defense army.

[Announcer] A defense army seems to be of slightly questionable value in our small Estonia, considering what forces are around us both in Europe and across the big water, as well as our eastern neighbor. Can we defend ourselves with a defense army?

[Tamme] It is not at all of questionable value if we correctly work out the true purpose of the defense army. In contemporary international life even a great power will not defend itself soley with military force. And even that is not correct. This must be done by international law and diplomacy. But the task of the defense army, in case of a possible conflict as I repeat again, is to define the situation. It is precisely the defense army which defines the conflict—with any intruder which potentially violates the border—which arises as and when the border is being violated. The conflict must be defined for hours, days, and months and I hold fully to the position that this is not a final solution but the initial step on the ladder.

[Announcer] That is, the moment was also left undefined. It was not done in 1939.

[Tamme] Yes, and there are not a few politicians—our political enemies—who are indeed hinting at this. Namely, the conflict was left undefined and the conclusion is drawn that everything that took place was a result of the free will of the people.

Premier Apologizes for Leningrad 'Provocation'

PM1009151990 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 8 Sep 90 Second Edition p 5

[Unattributed report: "Accusations Made"]

[Text] E. Savisaar, chairman of the Estonian Council of Ministers, has sent I.S. Silayev, chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers, a telegram in which he says that "the government of the Estonian Republic expresses its regret at the hooligan actions of a group of members of the public organization Kajtselijt on the night of 2 September in the region of Komarovka settlement in Leningrad Oblast." The republic government, the telegram goes on to stress, views what happened as a clearly provocative action—a point also made in the government statement of 3 September. The telegram announces that "in order to avert a recurrence of similar unlawful actions, the Estonian government has instructed the republic's Ministry of Internal Affairs to prevent the organization of acts of provocation in the future." "I hope," E. Savisaar says in conclusion, "that the present incident will not cause a deterioration in the traditional good-neighborly relations between our republics."

Envoys Visit Embassies on German Unification

LD0709144390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1300 GMT 7 Sep 90

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] Representatives of Lithuania and Latvia have visited the embassies of Great Britain, France, and both Germanies in Moscow in view of the talks concerning German unification due to open in Moscow on 12 September. In the Baltics, this issue is associated with that of the status of all the Baltic republics.

Baltic States' Protection Bodies Meet in Vilnius

LD0709202690 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1900 GMT 7 Sep 90

[Text] A consultative meeting of the three Baltic states—the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian—Supreme Council State Protection Commission representatives, and also of leaders of departments involved in state

protection, opened today in Vilnius. Questions involving state border protection and control, the system of collective security, and other vital questions, are under discussion.

The consultations will continue for two days.

Baltic Military Appeals for Deserters' Return

LD0909174190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0000 GMT 9 Sep 90

[Text] An appeal to all young men who had deserted military units and their parents is being disseminated by the Military Council of the Baltic Military District of the USSR Armed Forces, urging these young men once again to return to their military units.

The appeal says that those who return voluntarily to continue their military service will receive certain concessions. Questions concerning instituting criminal proceedings against them will be resolved in their favour.

The appeal received a negative assessment by the participants of the conference on national security of the three Baltic states, which concluded today. Audrius Butkevicius, director general of the Lithuanian security department, pointed out that the question of deserters from the Soviet Armed Forces was one of the most important issues at the latest consultative conference of the three Baltic states. A joint group has been set up which will go to Moscow to USSR Defense Minister D. Yazov, and will attempt to resolve the issue.

Next week, representatives from Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia will try to discuss the problems of deserters from the Soviet Armed Forces with the commander of the Baltic Military District in Riga."

RSFSR

Coverage of RSFSR Supreme Soviet Session

Ministerial Candidates Discussed

PM0609151190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Sep 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report by Ye. Sorokin and V. Shirokov: "Intensive Work. At the Russian Congress"]

[Excerpts] As PRAVDA has already reported, the second RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet session is spending these three days—4, 5, and 6 September—in committees and commissions. [passage omitted]

The committees and commissions are continuing to discuss candidates for future ministers. The contenders are undergoing a rigorous test of competence—their programs must take into account new approaches toward the political and economic processes taking place in the RSFSR and the Union. Yesterday the members of committees and commissions met with the following ministerial candidates: L. Cheshinskiy, minister of grain products; Yu. Solomin, minister of culture; V. Barannikov, minister of internal affairs; and V. Yefimov, minister of transport.

Barannikov on Power Transfers

LD0809122790

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1030 GMT 8 September broadcasts an eight-minute report by correspondent A. Nikiforov from today's Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet session on further ministerial appointments. He notes that the following have been appointed: Valeriy Aleksandrovich Shubin, RSFSR minister of the forestry industry; Aleksandr Fedorovich Khlystov, Minister of Trade; and Vasiliy Nikolayevich Machuga, chairman of the RSFSR State Committee for Sport.

Nikiforov says that Mikhail Vladimirovich Chezhevskiy was rejected as chairman of the State Committee for Architecture and Construction, and that the appointment of Zoya Afanasyevna Kornilova to the post of deputy chairman for social policy is now under discussion.

Nikiforov then interviews Viktor Pavlovich Barannikov, the newly elected RSFSR Minister of Internal Affairs. Barannikov says that the RSFSR Ministry of Internal Affairs has been set up to safeguard the rights and security of Russian citizens. He adds: "In line with the decision by the first [RSFSR] Congress of People's Deputies, to the effect that the RSFSR Ministry of Internal Affairs is subordinate solely to the Russian Council of Ministers and cooperates with the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, we have reviewed the powers, structure, and functions of the ministry. The Ministry assumes full responsibility for maintaining law and order, detecting and investigating crime, and consequently for the entire volume of work in managing bodies and subdivisions located on the territory of the Russian Federation. Our relationship with the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs must develop purely on a contractual basis—of course that means on the basis of agreements defining the powers and naturally the responsibilities of each side." Barannikov says that 18 legislative acts concerning the management of internal affairs are currently being prepared by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet committees and commissions.

It is too early to say that powers and facilities have already been handed over to the Russian Internal Affairs Ministry, Barennikov adds. The RSFSR Council of Ministers has submitted a letter to the Union Ministry on this subject and talks will be held on the transfer of powers.

Ministerial Candidates Listed

LD0809213690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1742 GMT 8 Sep 90

[Announcement by I. Silayev, chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, at RSFSR Supreme Soviet session in Moscow, on 8 September—recorded]

[Text] We would like to ask you today to examine the following candidacies: Comrade Nikolay Vasilyevich Machugal for the post of chairman of the RSFSR State Committee for Physical Culture and Sport; Comrade Aleksandr Fedorovich Khlystov, as Minister of Trade; Comrade Vitaliy Borisovich Yefimov as Minister of Transport; Comrade Mikhail Vladimirovich Chezhevskiy as chairman of the State Committee of the RSFSR for Architecture and Construction; Comrade Leonid Stepanovich Chishinskiy as Minister of Grain Products; Comrade Valeriy Aleksandrovich Shubin as Minister of the Forestry Industry; and Comrade Viktor Pavlovich Barannikov as Minister of Internal Affairs of the RSFSR.

A few words about a question raised yesterday, too, stating that the capital predominates here in the candidacies which we are proposing to you for examination. This is how it is today: Comrade Machugal is from Krasnodar, Comrade Shubin is from Chelyabinsk oblast.

Yes, comrades, I'm sorry I haven't expressed my attitude, well, about what you said about the State Committee for Sport holding talks on a deal worth thousands of millions. I think that is a correct question.

I have heard—I stress, I have heard—that our, well, city, Sochi, and I think that probably all of us, well, probably would support, well, such intentions to put forward the candidacy of that city for the Olympic Games. I mean not only the purely sporting interest, but of course the possibility of providing it with comprehensive facilities, of its development, particularly social, and so forth. But of course such a large deal cannot be implemented without the Supreme Soviet and when, let's say, the matter reaches the RSFSR Council of Ministers, we of course will not take a decision without presenting that question to you and without having received the appropriate support as, it goes without saying, on other major planned deals too, and on everything which concerns out budget, be it our ruble or hard currency budget. I am firmly convinced that a more or less major, and maybe the Supreme Soviet could determine that limit, that level, above which, in millions of rubles, the government is obliged to submit the appropriate proposals and to receive or not to receive support from the Supreme Soviet. [sentence as heard]

I ask you, esteemed comrades, members of the Supreme Soviet, to examine the candidacies put forward and I ask you to support them.

Regional Party Holds Central Committee Plenum

Polozkov Discusses Plenum

LD0709203590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 7 Sep 90

[Report by correspondent N. Shakhova from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Shakhova] This morning in the editorial office I was assigned to go to the CPSU Central Committee press center at 1500 [1100 GMT] for the start of a press conference on this major event [the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR) Communist Party Central Committee plenum] but the journalists had to wait until 1900 and I must say that we were all patient.

We are slightly ahead of events so we will not be in time for "Vremya." Ivan Kuzmich, how did this first plenum go and what are the results as you see them?

[Polozkov, RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee first secretary] The plenum was a very active one. Suffice it to say that it took virtually an entire working day to settle the organizational matters. Very many people spoke. I think the reason for this is that the plenum passed off in the most democratic way. Nominations were discussed freely and we consulted on all practical affairs issues, primary tasks, and organization and cadres issues. The voting was on a contested basis. Several candidates were discussed for each post and the voting went very well. I think the Politburo elected at the plenum.... I have every reason to state that it is able-bodied and capable of fulfilling the hopes of Russia's communists.

[Shakhova] You are all members of the Politburo. I would like you to introduce yourselves to the viewers in literally just a few words. Go ahead please.

[Antonovich] My name is Antonovich. Ivan Ivanovich and I will be in charge of cooperation issues with various parties and public movements. We welcome a diversity of opinions, seek it, and will work fruitfully in the polyphony that has arisen out of glasnost.

[(Suganov)] (Suganov, Gennadiy Andreyevich). I will be involved with ideological work in the Russian Communist Party. One of my main tasks is to establish closer and more amicable contacts above all with the mass information media, the intelligentsia, and the workers' movement.

[(Ivgin)] (Ivgin, Aleksey Nikolayevich). I will be working on party cadres organizational work problems. The situation now is completely different for the primary organizations, for the rayon committees, and the oblast committees. I think one of the primary tasks is to help them get their bearings in this new situation.

[Shakhova] Eighteen members of the Politburo were elected today by secret ballot. An interesting detail: only

one nomination for politburo membership went uncontested, and that was (Nina Prokopiyevna Selkova). She will be working on women's movement issues.

There was much interest today by Soviet and foreign journalists—both the practical issues that have to be addressed without delay by Russia's communists, and the structural subdivisions being organized. Today's press conference by Russian Communist Party Politburo members and congress delegates was notable for its calm, business-like, and thorough discussion.

Party Plenum Elects Officials

LD0709211390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2030 GMT 7 Sep 90

[Excerpts] Moscow, 7 Sep (TASS)—A report on the plenum of the Central Committee of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party, held on 7 September, was released here today. It says:

A plenum of the Central Committee of the RSFSR Communist Party was held in Moscow on 7 September 1990. It examined organizational questions. [passage omitted]

In a secret ballot the following were elected members of the Politburo:

I.I. Antonovich, A.M. Bryachikhin, V.N. Yenina, G.A. Zyuganov, A.N. Ilyin, N.V. Kalinin, V.I. Kashin, D.N. Kugultinov, N.K. Lyubimov, A.G. Melnikov, I.K. Polozkov, Y.N. Prokopyev, N.P. Silkova, A.S. Sokolov, V.N. Stepanov, K.V. Frolov, V.V. Chikin, and V.V. Yashin.

A.N. Ilyin was elected second secretary of the Central Committee of the RSFSR Communist Party.

I.I. Antonovich, G.A. Zyuganov, V.I. Kashin, A.G. Melnikov, N.P. Silkova, and A.S. Sokolov were elected secretaries of the Central Committee. [passage omitted]

Politburo, Secretariat Elected

PM0709220790 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 8 Sep 90 Second Edition p 1

[Report: "First Plenum of RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee"]

[Text] A plenum of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party Central Committee was held in Moscow 7 September 1990 to examine organizational questions. Taking part in the plenum's work were members of the Communist Party's Central Committee and Central Control Commission elected at the RSFSR Communist Party's Constituent Congress, first secretaries of kray and oblast party committees, and representatives of the party press.

The session opened with a brief introductory speech by I.K. Polozkov, first secretary of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee, who set out his ideas on the structure and makeup of the republic Communist Party's leading organs. There was an animated and democratic exchange of opinions on this issue. During the discussion the list of candidate members of the Politburo and secretaries of the party Central Committee was decided on a contested basis.

I.I. Antonovich, A.M. Bryachikhin, V.N. Yenina, G.A. Zyuganov, A.N. Ilin, N.V. Kalinin, V.I. Kashin, D.N. Kugultinov, N.Kh. Lyubimov, A.G. Melnikov, I.K. Polozkov, Yu.N. Prokopyev, N.P. Silkova, A.S. Sokolov, V.N. Stepanov, K.V. Frolov, V.V. Chikin, and V.V. Yashin were elected Politburo members by secret ballot.

A.N. Ilin was elected second secretary of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee and I.I. Antonovich, G.A. Zyuganov, V.I. Kashin, A.G. Melnikov, N.P. Silkova, and A.S. Sokolov were elected secretaries.

Taking part in the plenum's work were O.S. Shenin, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Yu.A. Manayenkov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; N.S. Stolyarov, chairman of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Control Commission; and D.T. Yazov, member of the Presidential Council and USSR defense minister.

Paper Reports on Plenum

PM0709221190 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 8 Sep 90 Second Edition p 1

[Report: "Plenum of RSFSR Communist Party Central Control Commission"]

[Text] The first plenum of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party Central Control Commission was held in Moscow 7 September.

The plenum elected the RSFSR Communist Party Central Control Commission Presidium comprising N.S. Stolyarov, chairman of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Control Commission; P.Ya. Slezko, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Control Commission; N.F. Katkov, senior secretary of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Control Commission; and the following members of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Control Commission Presidium—B.I. Balashov, A.A. Vlasenko, V.M. Gorbunov, A.P. Dumachev, A.Ya. Nemtinov, Yu.N. Nikolayev, and G.N. Fedorova.

The plenum examined the draft structures of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Control Commission and the provisions on its Presidium, and defined the basic guidelines for its activity in the immediate future.

Yeltsin Talks With Russian Trade Union Chief

LD0609134990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 6 Sep 90

[Text] We have just received information about a meeting between Yeltsin, chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet, and Klochkov, chairman of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia. They discussed issues concerning the establishment of cooperation to seek ways to resolve very acute problems.

Klochkov spoke in detail about preparations for the concluding stage of the founding congress of the RSFSR trade unions at which formation of a Russian trade union association of a fundamentally new type will be completed. He said that specific proposals and a package of legislative acts aimed at defending the interests of working people have been drawn up to be submitted at the session of the republic's Supreme Soviet. Among them is a bill on legal guarantees for trade union activity in the republic and a declaration on the rights of the working people of the Russian Federation.

Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin stressed the need to build mutual relations between the independent trade unions which are being revived and the new bodies of Soviet power on a solid basis of treaties and agreements.

Poll Shows Yeltsin Has Highest Approval Rating

LD0709102790 Moscow World Service in Russian 0930 GMT 7 Sep 90

[INTERFAX report from the "Soviet Chronicle" feature of the "Soviet Union Day by Day" program]

[Text] The All-Union Center for the Study of Public Opinion has carried out a survey in the Soviet Union with the purposes of elucidating the population's attitude toward various political figures in the country. Some 2,680 persons from various strata of the population were questioned. Although the center had prepared the results of its poll by 13 July, they have not so far been published. According to the results of the poll, Boris Yeltsin has the highest rating—61.3 percent of those questioned fully approve of his activities, 21 percent do not fully approve, and 5.3 percent do not approve at all. Mikhail Gorbachev's activities are fully approved by 28.5 percent of those questioned, 40 percent do not fully approve, and 19.5 percent do not approve at all.

Replying to a request to name one or two persons in the country whose activities are liked most of all, 34.2 percent of those questioned named Boris Yeltsin, 10.2 percent Mikhail Gorbachev, and 2.7 percent Nikolay Ryzhkov.

Democratic Platform Official Addresses Congress

LD0709013190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1808 GMT 6 Sep 90

[Speech by V.S. Lepitskiy, representing the Democratic Platform, at the 6 September constituent congress of the RSFSR Communist Party in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] Dear comrades! At the end of the 28th congress a group of its delegates—advocates of the Democratic Platform (CPSU)—announced that they were dissociating themselves from the party. While understanding the reasons for that, and recognizing their right to political self-determination, many of those who used to work with them within the Democratic Platform did not support their decision, and did not agree with the conclusion of the non-reformability of our party. We saw our chance to develop and continue our efforts for its renewal in the results of the congress. Today responsibility for the party's future must be shown not just in declaring and disputing one's special stand, but in the ability and desire of Communists to display mutual understanding and compromises.

Proceeding from these considerations, the section of reforming Communists of the Democratic Platform suggested and submitted to the preparatory committee its own full and complete alternative version of the program of action. We were promised that all the delegates would be acquainted with it. That is why I emphasize only the positions that were included at our initiative in the published text. They are:

—the readiness of the party to act exclusively within the framework of law and only by political means;
—its firm renunciation of claims to a monopoly on its ideology;
—positions connected with the defense of the rights of minorities, with the development of horizontal structures, and with the redistribution of the forces of Communists in favor of territorial organizations;
—the will to cooperate with other political parties and movements;
—and an appeal to other parties to discuss the issues relating to civil accord along with an anti-crisis program jointly at a roundtable.

A point on the possibility of using the resources and the material basis of the party to support a number of social programs for the development of science, culture, education, and health care was also introduced at the suggestion of reforming Communists. Besides, we think that the formation of an independent material basis and budget for the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Communist Party would allow us to take stock of it in a detailed and open manner, in order once and for all to solve all the problems that originate in connection with it. Of course it is not those—though sufficiently important—positions that now define the image of the party that is emerging. It will be judged, and it is already judged, by its attitude to the economic reform.

Our approach was reflected in an alternative version of the social and economic section that was included in the published text. Its essence is in the fact that today social rather than ideological demands should be made of the economy. People need an efficient economy that is able to pay, and pay generously, for the constantly growing needs of the social sphere, culture, science, and education. The previous economic system—to put it mildly—did not convince us of its ability to satisfy such needs. Thus the duty of Communists is to help transform it in such a way that it will be able to do so, to learn to defend the social interests of workers not only in market conditions, but mainly with its help overall.

Attitude to the market economy is a touchstone. It is the choice of a path and future. It is the choice from which we cannot escape. We cannot hide behind any phrases. This choice will determine whether the party will be a locomotive for the most progressive tendencies, or whether it will find itself in the position of a railcar that has been unhooked in an out of the way branch line.

Today—and this is illustrated by the progress of our congress—we have to admit that we have already lost the first half of the game. There is only one way to rectify the situation: This is to base our work not just on what is going to happen tomorrow but the day after tomorrow, to take into account the new conditions and the new social forces which are still being forged on the crucible of economic reform and the scientific and technical revolution. But this will require a completely different strategy. Right now there is some doubt as to whether we do have any long-term strategy encompassing the whole party. At the moment one constantly feels that we have lost our ability not just to predict the course of events but even to notice in good time the ones which have already taken place. How else can one explain, for instance, the rocklike immobility of the official position on the question of depoliticizing the civil service and the military—even though the state has already made a decision on this?

Though it gives me no pleasure whatsoever, I have to remind you that when quite a while ago the Democratic Platform expressed its view on this, it was considered a terrible sedition. But now, whether we like it or not, hundreds of thousands of Communists are going to be ousted from state establishments and some production collectives in the very near future. But where will they be ousted to? Are the territorial organizations in their present form prepared for such a turn of events? I think the answer is fairly obvious to everyone here. Consequently, we must provide for a thoroughgoing reform of the territorial organizations—particularly because if they fail to achieve a qualitative leap, unavoidable defeat awaits us at elections on every level.

From the very start, the formative process of the RSFSR Communist Party has been a very difficult one, and our congress gives no grounds for believing that it will now proceed more smoothly. In this connection I would like to support the idea of holding a congress in 1991—a congress rather than a conference. A congress that will adopt a fully fledged program and rules document. In the latter—the rules document—we must find a proper solution to the issue of RSFSR Communist party membership and the procedure for joining it, an issue that is totally ill-considered but that offends Communists most of all. This surprises and insults many more than anything else: the fact that one can be registered in a party, in a new party, without a personal choice, without even the opportunity of discussing the issue.

Here again we have to mention the need to look—if only one step—ahead. During the debate we reflected over doubts as to whether we need program and rules documents of our own or not, but the process of federalization within the CPSU is now proceeding in such a way, and at such a pace, that we might again end up faced with a situation for which we are totally unprepared. Within the framework of the CPSU we should not think through and complete the process of setting up an independent Communist party of sovereign Russia.

Finally, I would like to say a few word about the situation at the congress. We are approaching the stage at which decisions must be made on the program of action. There are widespread views on this, which share little ground. I took part in the preparation of the published draft, and we put forward our views then. We probably became engrossed in it, and I would like to vouch that although it was very tough work, it was work in which there was a constant striving toward mutual understanding. It would be very nice if at the final of our congress, too, we were guided by that very striving: if we could find solutions that do not set Moscow and the rest of Russia at odds, that do not set Communists with different views in opposition and against one another. Wisdom, prudence, and tolerance: this is what must lie at the basis of our decisions today.

RSFSR's Silayev Receives Cuban Ambassador

LD0609201199 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 6 Sep 90

[Text] Ivan Stepanovich Silayev, chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Council of Ministers, today received Jose Roman Belaguer Cabrera, ambassador of the Republic of Cuba to the USSR, and had a friendly conversation with him. The ambassador spoke highly of the level of Soviet-Cuban relations, expressed hope for a broad development of Cuba's ties with Russia, and noted the great opportunities which exist on both sides for this.

Ivan Stepanovich Silayev stated Russia's readiness to develop various ties with friendly Cuba. It was agreed to take practical steps in this direction.

The chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers asked for great gratitude to be conveyed to the Cuban leadership for taking care of the health of Soviet children from areas which suffered as a result of the Chernobyl accident.

RSFSR Central Control Commission Meets

LD0709184290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1530 GMT 7 Sep 90

[Text] The first plenum of the Central Control Commission of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party took place in Moscow today. The presidium of the Central Control Commission of the RSFSR Communist Party was elected at the plenum. It consists of Stolyarov, chairman of the Central Control Commission of the RSFSR Communist Party; Slezko, deputy chairman of the Central Control Commission of the RSFSR Communist Party; Katkov, executive secretary of the Central Control Commission of the RSFSR Communist Party; and the members of the Presidium of the Central Control Commission of the Communist Party Balashov, Vlasenko, Gorbunov, Dumachev, Nemtinov, Nikolayev, and Fedorova.

The plenum considered a draft for the structure of the Central Control Commission of the RSFSR Communist Party and provisions for its presidium, and defined the main directions of its activities in the near future.

Moscow Mayor Criticizes Failure of Perestroyka

LD0109194190 Moscow TASS in English 1642 GMT 1 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Lev Aksenov]

[Text] Moscow September 1 TASS—"The country is sliding into a critical situation which cannot be avoided—this is the essence of the moment this country is now going through," chairman of the Moscow City Council Gavriil Popov told activists of the Moscow Voters' Association here today.

He said that the situation was caused by the fact that perestroika has failed to reach its practical stage. Popov told the gathering of his proposals for taking the country and its capital city out of the deadlock.

The Moscow leader stressed the need to consolidate all democratic forces of society, which is especially important when the power-and-pressure system is being dismantled and the country is heading toward market relations.

Popov was not the only speaker at the gathering. One of the association's leaders, Mossoviet [Moscow Soviet] Deputy Vladimir Bokser spoke about reforming bodies of authority in the city and its districts.

He said that the executive branch should be reformed first of all. Similar plans are now being considered in Leningrad and other regions of Russia.

The Moscow Voters' Association was formed nearly eighteen months ago to support democratically-minded candidates for seats in the national parliament.

The association was also active during this year's elections to the Russian parliament and local councils. It helped organize pre-election meetings and discussions in support of candidates nominated by the Democratic Russia bloc.

Voters' societies have been created in each of Moscow's 33 districts to unite thousands of political activists concerned over the state of affairs in the country and the capital—workers, employees, intellectuals and the military who represent virtually every layer of the Moscow population.

The Voters' Association is one of the initiators of the Democratic Russia movement's founding congress scheduled for the end of October.

Currency Earnings Will Help Tourist Facilities

PM3008145390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 29 Aug 90

[Report by A. Melkonyan and N. Postoyalko from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Today, when regional and republic autonomy is being established, the future structure of Intourist is becoming unclear.

[Reporter] [video shows shots of Sochi hotels] The fact is that year in year out this sector, which produces the lion's share of some other countries' national income, fails to provide the expected foreign-currency inflows to the state's coffers. This is graphically visible in the example of a major subunit—Vauinturist—which is located in Sochi. The reasons have long been known to everyone—low-quality service and an inadequate number of facilities. [video shows Yu.N. Arintsev, director of the Zhemchuzhina Hotel]

[Arintsev] A reorganization of the Inturist system is long overdue—it has been discussed many times already. The [Russian] republic is now acquiring considerable autonomy, it is gaining its sovereignty. We're happy about that because it'll make it considerably easier for us to solve our problems in our own republics at local soviet level. But, while solving the problems of reorganization, we must not lose sight of the main thing—we must not destroy the system that has existed for 60 years. We must just make it more democratic. Whereas previously issues were mainly decided by leaders in Moscow, today there should be representatives of labor collectives involved in running things. Most tourists come on tours—they don't just visit individual republics or towns, usually they choose tours that take in a number of republics. That's why we absolutely must have a coordinating center.

[Reporter] Are you, by asserting the principle of republic autonomy, pinning your hopes on improving the quality of service across the range of facilities you offer? Have I got that right?

[Arintsev] Absolutely. Whereas previously we didn't earn any hard currency—nor did the city or the republic—today, once the main question of distributing the foreign exchange has been resolved, the republic, local

soviets, and enterprises will all get their share. Naturally, this will help us to solve problems better and provide a better service.

[Reporter] This is just one opinion. But it is so important that, when resolving a problem like the development of foreign tourism in our country, the wishes of all labor collectives from this department are taken into account.

Russian, Moldavian Groups Meet To Discuss Pact

LD0109125690 Moscow TASS in English 1213 GMT 1 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Anatoliy Golya]

[Text] Kishinev September 1 TASS—A working meeting between the delegation of the Russian and Moldavian parliaments was held here today.

The parliamentations are expected to coordinate work to conclude a treaty between the Moldavian Republic and the Russian Federation on the basis of the sovereignty declarations adopted by the two republics.

The Russian delegation is headed by member of the Russian parliament Presidium Aleksandr Granberg and the Moldavian delegation by first deputy head of the Moldavian parliament Ion Khadyrke.

RSFSR, Georgia Sign Cooperation Agreement

LD0209063590 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1700 GMT 1 Sep 90

[Text] Today an agreement on all-around cooperation was signed in the RSFSR House of Soviets between the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic [RSFSR] and the Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic [GSSR]. This document—an important step in the development of cooperation between the republics which is mutually beneficial and which enjoys equal rights—was signed by Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet; Gumbaridze, chairman of the Presidium of the GSSR Supreme Soviet; Silayev, chairman of RSFSR Council of Ministers; and Chitanava, chairman of the Georgian SSR Council of Ministers.

State Foreign Exchange 'Monopoly' To End

PM0709114990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 3

[INTERFAX report: "Draft Law 'On Foreign-Currency Regulation'"]

[Text] The USSR Council of Ministers has elaborated a USSR draft law "On Foreign-Currency Regulation" as part of the overall package of draft legislative acts ensuring the transition to a regulated market economy. The need for this legislative act is dictated by the expansion of the range of participants in foreign-currency operations in the shape of Soviet enterprises and organizations, the development of new forms of business cooperation, the introduction of foreign currency into economic turnover within the country, changes in the USSR's international accounts—including accounts with the CEMA countries—and the movement toward making the Soviet ruble convertible. In accordance with the new economic management conditions, the draft envisages limiting the framework of the state foreign-currency monopoly. A wide range of republic-level specialized and commercial banks will be permitted to service foreign-currency operations.

RSFSR Food, Agriculture Minister Interviewed

PM3108153390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Aug 90 Second Edition p 2

[Interview with G. Kulik, RSFSR minister of agriculture and food, by O. Stepanenko, under the rubric "Interview at New Ministry": "Peasant Russia"—first paragraph is an editorial introduction]

[Text] As is well known, a Ministry of Agriculture and Food has been created in Russia. Readers are asking many questions about this: Why is this, what are its aims and functions? G. Kulik, first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers and minister of agriculture and food of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic], now answers.

[Stepanenko] Gennadiy Vasilyevich, a brand new ministry has been set up. Why?

[Kulik] There is no task in the economy more important than rectifying the situation in the countryside. A skilled staff is needed for that. That is what our ministry will be.

[Stepanenko] Is its creation not a return to the past?

[Kulik] If you take a formal approach, yes. But in fact it is a step forward. Both the State Agro-Industrial Committee [Gosagroprom] and the former ministry were basically command-style organs. Our task is to influence agriculture by economic levers. A different principle, a different structure, too.

[Stepanenko] Could you tell us about it?

[Kulik] New services are being created—marketing, market forecasting and development, the elaboration of a tax policy and a taxation system, the implementation of the land reform, and support for peasant holdings. And the old services are being given new content. Take the Agrosnab [Agricultural Committee for Material and Technical Supply] for example. Its functions amounted basically to the centralized distribution of resources. Now it is going to be a major commercial center. Via a ramified network in the oblasts and rayons it will link those who produce the means of production and industrial output with the collective farms [kolkhoz], state farms [sovkhoz], and food enterprises.

[Stepanenko] And how do you intend to achieve a breakthrough and rectify the situation?

[Kulik] The enthusiasm for leasing and attempts to use leasing to remedy matters have shown us once again that there is no panacea for agriculture. We propose a package of measures: Change production relations, switch to market principles, and strengthen the material and technical base.

[Stepanenko] Why is strengthening the base left to last? You yourself have said a number of times: It is so weak that on many farms and even in rayons neither new relations nor the market will be able to ensure production growth.

[Kulik] Yes, the depths of the Non-Chernozem, the Northern Urals, the Far East, Siberia, and other regions are in disarray: normal work and life are impossible there—they have no communications, roads, or hospitals. We are preparing the basic estimates for the Second Congress of Russian People's Deputies, which will adopt a program to provide the republic with food. If the countryside gets everything that it needs for normal work, production will follow. Nevertheless, I am convinced that without a radical change in production relations, the agro-industrial complex cannot be made more efficient.

[Stepanenko] Where do you plan to make changes?

[Kulik] Every possible means must be used to interest people in honest, conscientious work. I believe that different forms of ownership will help, too. Within the Russian Government structure there is a Committee on Land Reform. As I have already said, we are creating a subdivision in the ministry to work on this reform. It is one of the main, leading subdivisions. Judging by the urgency of land problems, it will have plenty to do. We propose legislation to allocate to soviet organs a quantity of land where, at their discretion, the farms of the future private farmers will be situated, including those of townspeople who have expressed a desire to enter farming. If someone leaves the kolkhoz or the sovkhoz, land must be allocated near his home. I think that a peasant holding with an enlarged allotment of land is a good foundation for establishing private farms, especially at the outset of the land reform.

[Stepanenko] Readers are concerned about this: What will happen to crop rotations? Will they be disrupted? Yields will decrease. And what about property? You cannot split up a livestock unit or a grain threshing floor.

[Kulik] That concern is unnecessary, in my opinion. It is well known that crop rotations are changeable. And if a large group of peasants want to organize their own farm they can review their crop rotation, too. And as for indivisible assets—why split them up? Calculate each person's share and allocate equipment, seed, and animals for the appropriate sum.... In brief, whatever the peasant wants. As for the fears that the advent of private farmers and the sale of land will lead to the appearance of hired labor and man's exploitation by man, I can tell you frankly that I do not share them. The size of the allotment determined by the soviet dependent on the number of family members, plus mechanization will make it possible to reduce the use of hired hands to a minimum. It goes without saying that the problems of the land reform are extremely complex. They will all be discussed at the Russian deputies' congress, which I am sure will adopt a fundamental decision. On the option that is economically most advantageous.

[Stepanenko] Incidentally, readers also ask about the economic aspect. Is there a guarantee that the new version will be more effective? What will it cost?

[Kulik] It will not be cheap, of course. Western experience has shown that. Last summer I met with U.S. farmers who had been working in the Kuban. I asked them: If they were masters of the land here rather than the kolkhozes [collective farm] and sovkhozes [state farms], would they produce more per hectare? "No," they replied. "With your equipment and servicing—far less."

[Stepanenko] In the article "Is the Russian Peasant Lazy?" published in PRAVDA 31 March, you mocked the error, and here I quote, made by "naive people who think that the food problem can be completely resolved just by changing the form of ownership and creating private farms. This is utopia! You cannot feed society adequately by working with shovels and pitchforks. The peasant must be armed with equipment to the same standard as developed countries have."

[Kulik] Yes, that is my conviction.

[Stepanenko] But will such a course not ruin us? I recall, you cited some figures: To create a 25-cow farm using the Dutch technique would cost $300,000-$400,000. It is not hard to estimate the cost: a dairy herd for Moscow Oblast alone would cost around $5 billion. If you convert that into rubles at the real rate, it would cost more than all the agriculture in the Union receives in a year.

[Kulik] The opponents of the development of peasant farms are now trying to intimidate people by citing the high cost of investment. But let us look at life as it really is, after all. Private farming will grow out of the peasant farming system. But not everyone is going to "go it alone" and build his own farm, and not all at the same time. Furthermore, this is the figure if you are starting from scratch. But the peasant has his home, barn, and farmstead. You do not need to buy equipment—you can hire it. All this must be subtracted.

[Stepanenko] So if we "look at life," how much will it cost? And has the increase in output been estimated? Doubts are being expressed—will private farming be more efficient in our country?

[Kulik] There are no precise figures: There is insufficient practical experience to work on. Nor can we produce any estimates until the package of laws on the land reform has been adopted.

[Stepanenko] Will the laws on the land and the measures of the government and the Russian Ministry of Agriculture not lead, as before, to the imposition of a new course from above? In this instance, the course of the compulsory redistribution of the land?

[Kulik] No. The old decisions and measures were mandatory instructions. The present ones are quite the reverse, they allow people to do things, they untie people's hands. An intelligent peasant will not do anything to harm himself or the countryside.

The mechanism for taking land away and allocating it will be ratified. It must be well worked out. In my view, rayon soviets must have the right to take specific decisions. They must decide whether it is advantageous to take land away and whether the applicant is capable of doing the farmer's job. That is a protection against the piecemeal seizure of land.

[Stepanenko] Some people think that the weak farms should be disbanded....

[Kulik] The technical equipment on weak kolkhozes and sovkhozes is outmoded. Private farmers will not be able to work properly and we will wreck the whole farm. But in general the fears that by our course of introducing private farming we are going to harm the kolkhozes and sovkhozes and that we are working toward the disbandment of a section of them are in my view exaggerated. I shall take an extreme case. The majority decide to leave a kolkhoz. They raise the question of the division of property. It is clear that cooperatives will have to be created: One group of peasants will take the livestock unit, for example, and begin producing milk, another takes the workshop with all the technical service facilities, and so on. And the kolkhoz becomes an association of cooperatives. It all tends in this direction even through private farms.

[Stepanenko] Why take such a complicated route then? Is it not better to use the tried and tested options? At the Ordzhonikidze Kolkhoz in Dagestan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, where M. Chartayev is chairman, they have made everyone full owners without fragmenting the kolkhoz. In 3 years production has almost doubled.

[Kulik] I have known Chartayev a long time, and I support his experiment. Essentially each worker there has the same incentive as the private farmer. Prosperity depends totally on the results of labor, the worker disposes of his own output himself. But I do not think that everything should be made to fit a stereotype. Different forms appear, people must be given the right to choose for themselves. And they should not be set against one another but promote close economic ties and integration. Life will show which form is best. To a considerable extent this will be determined by market relations, the extension of which is one point in our concept.

[Stepanenko] The market is a tough place. Even the first steps to increase the market freedom of enterprises led to an unprecedented leap in prices for resources and services.

[Kulik] The ruling force today is the totally unbridled economically accountable interests of industrial enterprises and services, which are reducing supply to a state of anarchy and chaos. For the sake of "its" profit and advantage industry has openly distanced itself from the countryside. In many areas the city has left the countryside to face up to an unprecedented harvest which is beyond its capacity.

In the initial stage the creation of a centralized food stock must be regulated. In Russian conditions this is particularly important. We must supply the major industrial centers—Moscow, Leningrad, and the northern regions. Furthermore, I cannot remember a single year when trouble did not beset this or that part of Russia. This year drought has affected many regions of Siberia, while floods have damaged farms in Chita Oblast and the Maritime Kray.

[Stepanenko] How do you think that the centralized fund will be formed?

[Kulik] There are two approaches here—the state order or the food tax. The more objectively you can determine the scale depending on land quality, the higher the level of accountability. We plan to include grain, sugar beet (sugar), meat, milk, wool, and vegetable oil in the centralized fund. The rest—around 70 types of produce—are to be sold on the basis of negotiation on contract and regulated prices. The prices for everything to be supplied to the centralized fund must be set by the state.

[Stepanenko] What about the size of the tax or the state order?

[Kulik] Everyone agrees: It must not exceed 70 percent of the volume of commodity production set on a farm in the past two to three years. Many incentives for farms have been proposed—ranging from the counter sale of resources to raising prices for products that the countryside sells above the negotiated contracts. We shall aim for the centralized allocation of resources and fixed prices for the most important types of equipment and materials.

[Stepanenko] The Peasant Union Congress expressed the view that frequent reorganizations of management in agriculture are a sign of uncertainty, failure to understand processes, and bankruptcy of the leadership's concepts.

[Kulik] Management reorganizations are forced upon you. We are trying to draw lessons from bitter experience. We want to organize management on firm principles. For the first time we are clearly distinguishing between state and economic functions. State functions are being concentrated in the ministry. The economic

functions will be performed by various types of associations, unions, amalgamations, and cooperatives, which are created by the producers themselves on a voluntary basis. Incidentally, we have such things here. There are the unions of food and fruit and vegetable producers, the "Rossiyskaya Pushnina" [Russian Fur] Association, and the apicultural development cooperative. Recently a stock breeding association was set up in the republic. Nor will we discard the positive element produced by the Gosagroprom [State Agro-industrial Committee]: the idea, the principle of integration. It has been quite well applied in many regions. In Russia there are 311 agro-industrial complexes and associations of the "Kuban" and "Novomoskovskoye" type. They are proving very effective. Integrated services will also exist in the ministry. But we will eliminate the mistakes of the old Gosagroprom.

[Stepanenko] Such as?

[Kulik] The destruction of specialized sectors and organs of management of certain types of industry. For example, the perfumery and tobacco industries. Think, what kind of connection is there between the tobacco factories in Irkutsk, Tomsk, and Sverdlovsk and agriculture, if even geological excavations cannot confirm that tobacco was once produced in those regions?

[Stepanenko] What do you consider the ministry's main task today?

[Kulik] On the strategic level, to remedy Russia's agro-industrial complex. To make it viable. So that there can never be a repetition of the situation that we are experiencing today. It will be necessary, of course, to develop not only our internal agrarian mechanisms but also the main statewide one—combining the interests of the city and countryside. But at the moment all of us—the minister, the peasant, and the industrial worker—must protect what has been produced by means of hard work. And it is our duty to remember that the countryside is in difficulty. Peasant Russia is summoning everyone to help today.

Reasons for Moscow Bread Shortage Viewed

PM0709134190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Article by E. Gonzalyez: "Waiting in Line for Bread"]

[Text] On Sunday Muscovites waited in line for bread. They had to stand actually out on the street at some bakeries. There were no lines at other stores, but only because there was no bread. None at all!

To whom am I addressing this information? Muscovites saw it all and know for themselves. A conference about this has already been held at the CPSU Central Committee. Back on 28 August the Moscow Soviet Executive Committee Presidium discussed the question "On Strengthening the Material and Technical Base of the Bread Baking, Pasta, and Milling Industry; Specialized Transport; and Trade Enterprises in Moscow City in 1991-1995." Moscow and Munich radio reported the interruptions in bread sales. In short, everyone knows everything. So I am addressing just one man—my colleague Yuriy Feofanov, a specialist in jurisprudence. He has long been trying to find out why everything or almost everything used to be available, but now everything or almost everything is disappearing.

"There is a whole complex of reasons...." is how I usually begin an explanation. But the discussion went no further than the first reason.

"Everything is clear," Yuriy Vasilyevich interrupted, "but what there also used to be was the edict system, and televisions, chairs, refrigerators, and packs of cigarettes lay around in piles."

Bread is probably the last opportunity for explanations. As quite recent history testifies, there may not be another shortage.

Right, there is a whole complex of reasons. The first is that not enough bread is being baked in Moscow today, although more is being baked than yesterday. Therefore yesterday M. Chaplin, general director of "Moskhlebprom," could have assessed the situation in more or less the following terms: "We have secured an increase in output compared with 1989...." And he would have been right.

Of course, today Mikhail Alekseyevich would put it differently: "The infrastructure of our sector has remained at the level of the fifties when there were only a little over half as many people living in Moscow." And again he would be right.

But back in July, even in August, there was enough bread. It has to be noted that demand for bread increases every year in late August—children and parents are going back to school. But this year there was a particular surge in demand. It is easily explained—it is more difficult to buy meat, pasta, herring, and so on. Of course, it is impossible to compensate for the shortage of foodstuffs with bread alone. Not for long, anyway. But it is possible for a while to avoid exacerbating the food problem, to respond quickly to demand, and to plug the hole.

But there is no one to do it. Not only are bakery equipment and the bakeries themselves a legacy from our grandfathers' time purchased during the first five-year plans; but no one is making modern equipment for the sector, and anyhow wages in the bread industry are miserly. Who is going to work if the job is like tending an open-hearth furnace and the pay is like.... But let us refrain from making comparisons lest we offend someone.

New grades of bread were introduced three years ago. Maybe you remember? That is, there was a camouflaged price hike and an opportunity emerged to increase wages in the sector by an average of 14 percent. The industry

held out without losses for around a year, but then inflation again prompted people to change their job.

But is it impossible to resolve this problem without hiking bread prices? M. Chaplin reported that over the last five years the bread industry has paid over 300 million rubles [R] into the state budget and has received only R20 million from it.

Hang on, but isn't this the same theme that was struck in explaining the shortage of tobacco? And furniture? Or sewing machines? Wherever you look, the reasons are the same: Funds are not being allocated, the sector is not developing, wages are low, the work is hard.

But profitable! The only thing is that the workers do not see this profit. Whereas a consumer society has emerged in the West, a consumer state has emerged in our country. The tax system which it has proposed is yet further confirmation of this. We simply cannot grasp the elementary truth: People work eagerly for themselves. Moreover, people work eagerly for themselves even if they are simultaneously working for the benefit of someone else. But it is impossible to force people to work only for the benefit of someone else, even if the someone in question is their own state. So even the obsolete Moscow industry could bake almost 25 percent more bread today, but M. Chaplin simply has no idea how to do this.

What do the numerous conferences and sessions represent? Anything you like except the abandonment of the consumerist policy. They are prepared to send soldiers to help, they recommend involving vocational and technical school students, there was even talk that maybe we should immediately buy flour abroad instead of grain.... But why then not import loaves? It would be even better to speed up the adoption of the law on entry and exit, then people could rush off to Sweden themselves for bread.

To be serious, it must finally be admitted that today shortages are natural. We should be surprised not that something else has disappeared, but that there is still anything available because the main aim of any sector is by no means to satisfy demand—for bread, cigarettes, medicine, or cars—but to fulfill the plan (even if not 100 percent), directives, additional targets, and the rest for the sake of ultimately swelling the state budget. So far we have managed to do this, largely at the expense of our grandfathers' legacy. Alas, everything comes to an end sooner or later, and it transpires that you can be left without bread even when there is a bumper harvest.

What is to be done? It is easiest of all to say that we must more rapidly switch to market relations. But it looks as though no talk of the market will take the place of bread. Here I recall what I wrote just three years ago about the GDR experience. There was no market there at that time, of course. On the other hand, there were economic problems and plenty of them. But not so far as bread was concerned. Even then in the GDR there were thousands of private bakeries, bread stores, and pastry stores. Existing alongside the state ones, of course.

But we are still convinced that it is socialism when bread is baked not by professional bakers with an interest in the end result but by soldiers from the nearest garrison.

Leningrad Reported on Verge of 'Food Crisis'

PM3108135590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Aug 90 Second Edition p 1

[Report by correspondent V. Gerasimov under the "Harvest Time" rubric: "Just Projects for the Time Being"]

[Text] Leningrad—I read a report in LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA on the latest session of the CPSU obkom [oblast party committee] bureau. It discussed the situation regarding harvesting and the population's food supply. Each day the city experiences a shortfall of 300-400 tonnes of locally produced vegetables.

Large-scale harvesting is to start soon, but many enterprises and higher educational institutions have not even concluded sponsorship assistance contracts with farms. The fields are weed-strewn and vegetable and root crops are perishing in goosefoot and camomile thickets. The newspaper report assesses the situation in these terms: The region is on the verge of a food crisis.

The Leningrad City Soviet decision on the refusal of city-dwellers to offer sponsorship assistance played its part here. Sheltering beneath this document, organs of state power and the representatives of many collectives have shirked any practical concern for agricultural production. The decision later taken by soviets, which is in general terms correct and goes so far as to declare a state of emergency for the harvesting period, remains for the time being no more than a declaration.

Leningraders' indignation at the shortage of goods and the high prices, the obkom bureau rightly noted, is mounting. Above all among the low-paid categories of working people. The CPSU obkom has resolved that communists and party organizations must start resolute work and convince by argument the largest possible number of city-dwellers that their support is essential in the countryside.

However, this too is just intentions so far. Will they remain, like the city and oblast soviet decisions, merely an alluring declaration.

Leningrad Obkom Assesses 28th Party Congress

LD3108031490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1721 GMT 30 Aug 90

[Report by TASS correspondnet Aleksandr Rachko]

[Text] Leningrad, 30 Aug (TASS)—Leningrad Communists consider the main result of the 28th CPSU Congress which can and must become the real force capable of opposing the destructive processes leading to chaos and, in the final analysis, the disintegration of the USSR.

This is talked about in the action program of the Leningrad CPSU Oblast Committee [obkom], adopted at the extended plenum which took place today.

The program adopted will be the basis of the platform of Leningrad Communists at the second stage of the founding congress of the Communist Party of the Russian Federation, which opens in early September.

Boris Gidaspov, CPSU Central committee secretary and first secretary of the Leningrad party oblast committee, spoke at the plenum.

PRAVDA Reports on Leningrad Obkom Plenum

PM3108102190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Aug 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent V. Gerasimov: "Not Overstepping the Mark!"]

[Text] Leningrad, 30 Aug—The results of the 28th CPSU Congress and the political position and program of actions of the party oblast committee under the conditions of the transition to the market and the multiparty system were discussed at an expanded Leningrad CPSU Obkom [Oblast Committee] plenum in the Smolnyy. In the program of actions which was adopted the Leningrad Communists deem it necessary to convene a CPSU Central Committee plenum devoted to the elaboration of the party's strategy and tactics under the conditions of the transitional period.

In their speeches the Communists noted that the CPSU's elaboration of its concept of the market requires in-depth analysis and a realization of the party's new role. In the opinion of the Leningraders, the CPSU must adopt with regard to the state the position of a party of political disagreement and constructive opposition in those cases when state policy contradicts the working people's interests. Without removing itself from influencing the development of the socioeconomic sphere, the CPSU is called on to be the party of the social protection of the working person and his interests.

The obkom's program of actions adopted at the plenum will become the Leningrad Communists' main platform at the second stage of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Communist Party's Constituent Congress.

V.V. Gidaspov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Leningrad party obkom, delivered a report at the plenum.

Former Chief Executive To Head Kray Soviet

PM3008140590 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 29 Aug 90 p 1

[Unattributed, untitled report]

[Text] In a contest involving 13 candidates, N.I. Kondratenko, former chairman of the krayispolkom [executive committee] chairman, has been elected chairman of Krasnodar Kray Soviet in place of I.K. Polozkov, who has left the Kuban.

A curious feature is the fact that the legislative and executive organs will both be under the chairman's authority. One of his deputies will be krayispolkom chairman and the other will be responsible for organizing the work of the soviet itself.

Plenum Accepts Sochi Party Chief's Resignation

PM3008145190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Aug 90 First Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Combination of Posts Banned"]

[Text] Sochi (Krasnodar Kray), 29 Aug—The request by Yu. Polyakov, chairman of the city soviet, to be released from his duties as first secretary of the Sochi CPSU City Committee has been granted at a plenum of that party organ. Thus the resolution of the city soviet session banning the combination of the post of city soviet chairman with any other office in a state, cooperative, or public organization has been fulfilled.

"My opinion is that these two posts are incompatible," Yu. Polyakov said. "But I asked for the preliminary examination of this question to be carried out after the 28th CPSU Congress and the forthcoming city party organization's report and election campaign."

However, the deputies made the decision themselves.

The session planned to ask the kray party committee to transfer or lease buildings belonging to party committees. Incidentally, a number of premises in the city committee building have already been allocated to the city soviet.

Karelia To Try Trading Paper for Consumer Goods

PM3108080990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Aug 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report by A. Minin: "Decision Taken to Make Use of Powers"]

[Excerpts] The Karelian Council of Ministers has set up an emergency economic commission. Why is that?

The situation in the republic's consumer market is very complex. Supplies of food and non-food goods and material and technical resources from other parts of the country are still being disrupted. And on such a scale that the measures being taken to boost the production of consumer goods and livestock produce cannot possibly compensate for the shortfalls from elsewhere. The discrepancy is too great. [passage omitted]

Enterprises and organizations on the republic's territory regardless of departmental jurisdiction have been instructed to allocate for distribution by the emergency

commission 50 percent of their output produced in excess of state orders and at least 15 percent of the output not subject to state orders. Much of this may be used in exchange operations. For example, those who set up the emergency commission are thinking that the timber and paper which Karelia supplies to the country in vast quantities, high-grade construction materials, monumental stone, and costly facing materials for state buildings could be exchanged for very scarce consumer goods and production materials. Indeed, you can obtain almost anything for paper nowadays, but what impact will it have on publishers if state orders lose their force? The attempt to obtain as much paper as possible for open sale has already affected the production of many central newspapers this year. And a second point: will the new economic sanctions actually bring abundance to Karelia? Let us wait and see.

Anti-Nuclear Demonstration Staged in Ufa

LD0109111490 Moscow World Service in Russian 0930 GMT 1 Sep 90

[INTERFAX report from the "Soviet Chronicle" feature of "Soviet Union Day by Day" program]

[Text] At the instigation of a combined committee of public organizations, there has been picketing of the building in Ufa which houses the Council of Ministers and the Supreme Soviet of Bashkir. It is demanded that the construction of the Bashkir nuclear power station be halted. A rally was held in the town and up to 500 people attended. A resolution was adopted. The demand was voiced that the construction of the nuclear electric power station should be stopped immediately and that the towns of Ufa, Sterlitamak, Blagoveshchensk, and Neftekamsk should be regarded as ecological disaster zones.

New Oblast CPSU Committee Leader Elected

LD0209081290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 1 Sep 90

[Text] A plenum of the Kabardino-Balkarskaya Oblast CPSU Committee [obkom] took place in Nalchik today at which an organizational matter was examined. The plenum met Kokov's request to release him from the duties of first secretary of the party obkom given the need to concentrate on his work as chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Kabarda-Balkar Autonomous Soviet Socialist republic.

Six candidates were discussed for the post of first secretary of the party obkom. (Zumakulov), previously second secretary of this party obkom, was elected first secretary of Kabardino-Balkarskaya party obkom in a secret ballot.

Delays Affect GRES Construction in Transbaykal

LD0309114390

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian, at 0830 GMT on 3 September, in its "Vremya" newscast, broadcasts a two-minute program on continuing problems in the construction of the State Regional Electric Power Station (GRES) at Kharakurskaya. The announcer notes that a year ago the "Vremya" program described the lamentable state of affairs at the construction site of the Kharakurskaya GRES, a major project for the Transbaykal region. At a conference on the issue in Chita, Anatoliy Vasilyevich Kocherga, deputy USSR minister of power and electrification, stated that the first power unit would be commissioned in 1991. The announcer wonders how reliable was the word of one of the heads of this industry?

"Vremya" correspondents then report—over video of the construction site, unfinished housing, and interviews with workers—on the history of the GRES which has been under construction in Chita oblast for 15 years, costing the state 25 million rubles. Last year the government allocated additional funds to the Chitaenergo production association to complete the project, but as the project drags on wages drop and labor turnover spirals. Eight thousand people live in the settlement of Yasnogorsk which has grown up for the construction workers, and living conditions are very poor. Fundamental measures are needed otherwise the commissioning of the first unit will still be a long way off, the report notes.

Gasoline Supplies Run Out in Novokuznetsk

LD0709221190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 7 Sep 90

[Text] Today in Novokuznetsk, where more than 650,000 people live, the last reserves of gasoline have run out. It is difficult to say what will be the consequences of the fuel crisis. Kemerovo Oblast will not manage by its own efforts to stabilize the situation on motor transportation in the town which provides for the needs of industry and the social sphere in the near future.

There is a difficult situation in other towns and rayons of the Kuzbass. The situation that has taken shape has been examined in an emergency session of the Kemerovo town soviet. It has been decided to closed down the filling stations for personal motor vehicles and introduce stringent restrictions for the vehicles of the emergency services as well as vehicles used for delivering foodstuffs and the transportation of the new harvest, not to mention all the other industrial transportation.

If one takes account of the fact that the Siberian highway passes through Kemerovo Oblast and there is no gasoline for vehicles in transit either, then the explosive nature of the situation is obvious. The way out is seen in one thing—the swiftest possible repayment by the Chelyabinsk Nefteprodukt [Petroleum Product] association of the supplies of petroleum products that it owes the Kuzbass.

According to comments on this report by Masalov, deputy head of the wholesale trade and accounts department of the USSR State Commission for Material and

Technical Supply, the fact is that out of departmental self-interest enterprises have opted for easier plans, so in September the situation for mass consumers will remain very tense. Orders will be fulfilled on a 75 percent level, but fulfilled for the agro-industrial complex.

Western Republics

Moldavian President Reports on Gorbachev Talks

LD0709090790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1536 GMT 6 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Anatoliy Golya and Aleksandr Tanas]

[Text] Kishinev, 6 Sep (TASS)—Upon his return from Moscow, President Mircha Snegur of the Moldovan Republic today chaired a joint session of the Presidential Council, the parliamentary leadership, and the government of the republic. He informed the Presidential Council members of the content of his conversation with USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev, which was held at the initiative of the leadership of the Moldovan Republic.

During the meeting, both presidents favored tackling the problems which have arisen recently in connection with the anti-constitutional autonomy proclamation of the Gagauz and Pridnestrovye areas. Mircha Snegur reported that the USSR president spoke in favor of Moldova's integrity and indivisibility, and also favored all Union republics retaining sovereignty, in the economic as well as in the political fields.

The Supreme Soviet and the government of the republic, a TASS correspondent was told by the Moldova's president, will act to stabilize the social and political situation by political methods. It is of fundamental importance that all the citizens of the republic become aware of the fact that all our problems should, and will, be tackled in the parliament by parliamentary means. A "state" formed in contravention of the constitution in force will not be recognized by anyone.

Snegur Appeals to Self-Proclaimed Republics

LD0709111390 Moscow TASS in English 1046 GMT 7 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondents Anatoliy Golya and Aleksandr Tanas]

[Text] Kishinev September 7 TASS—Moldavian President Mircea Snegur has called on residents of the Gagauz and Dnestr republics "to heed the voice of reason and not give in to provocations by separatists." The Moldvian parliament has ruled the founding of these republics to be illegal.

In an address broadcast on Thursday night, the president said that "the escalation of illegal actions will lead to nothing good."

"Let's solve the existing problems together, without whipping up passions. All questions must be solved in the Moldavian parliament by parliamentary means. At present leaders of the Dnestr republic are actively canvassing for referendums on the territory of local councils which have refused to join the so-called Dnestr republic as part of the USSR.

"Let's ask ourselves: Who today can recognise the illegally-proclaimed republic in left-bank Moldavia? The Russian Federation or the Ukraine? I think that nobody will interfere in the internal affairs of our sovereign state. Even if such 'recognition' is forthcoming, Moldavia will then work out a different concept of Union treaty."

"Instead of political ambitions," Snegur continued, "it would be better to think together about how best to prepare for the winter."

The president called for "joint efforts to strengthen the economic might of Moldavia, in which all peoples have lived in peace and accord for centuries."

Dnestr Breakaway Threatens Moldavia's Unity

PM0709112490 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by E. Kondratov: "Moldova's Unity Under Threat"]

[Text] Kishinev—An extraordinary session of the Moldovan SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet has begun discussing the question of the deteriorating situation in the republic.

The reason for the convocation of the emergency session was the decision of people's deputies of the cities and rayons of the left bank of the Dnestr and Bendery City, meeting in Tiraspol, to form a Dnestr Moldavian SSR [Pridnestrovskaya Moldavskaya SSR], independent from Moldova.

We remind our readers that two weeks ago the formation of a Gagauz republic—also of Union republic rank within the framework of the USSR—was proclaimed in Komrat by deputies of Gagauz nationality. Mircha Snegur, chairman of the Moldovan SSR Supreme Soviet, described these decisions in his report at the session as a serious test for the republic. The offensive denial of everything that is dear to the Moldavian population—their language, alphabet, and symbols; the criminal disregard for laws passed by parliament—all this, according to M. Snegur, is calculated to destabilize the situation. In his words, the policy of discrediting parliament and the government, and now also the attempts to split Moldova's territory at a time when the dismantling of the administrative-command system has not yet been completed, is a stab in the back for the republic's sovereignty.

Did Sunday's events in Tiraspol come as a surprise for the Supreme Soviet deputies? No, it was clear to everyone where things were leading. Throughout all of this year, ideas of "our own destiny"—the restoration of

the Moldavian ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic] or the creation of a Dnestr republic—have become increasingly deeply established on the left bank. The Moldovan SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium time and again repealed as unlawful the results of referenda and decisions of sessions of left bank local soviets; however, with each passing month the threat of a split has hung increasingly clearly over Moldova, which is smaller than Bryansk Oblast in area. About two weeks ago the Gagauz decided to seize the Budzhak Steppes for themselves; and now there is Tiraspol. Moreover, the fact that, for the people, a Dnestr republic would be just as unnatural a progeny as the Berlin Wall is not even mentioned. Yet another example of how the axe of irrational policy hacks the country's body into pieces.

The sources of the division can be sought in the Soviet chapters of Moldova's history. From 1918 to 1940, the right bank of the Dnestr was part of Romania, while on the left bank there was Soviet power. The ideologues of separation of the Dnestr region constantly refer to this. No one recalls either the inhuman collectivization in these parts, or the famine in 1933 that was organized by Stalin's henchmen, or the repressions of 1937. The unattractiveness of the recent past is concealed by rejection of the present; specifically, of the changes now taking place in Moldova.

It was about these changes that deputies in Tiraspol spoke on Sunday in justification of their rift with the Moldovan SSR. The republic leadership was charged with putting into practice the nationalist strategy of the People's Front, which managed to get many of its supporters into parliament at the elections. This is why the Romanian tricolor has become the state flag and severe laws to punish disrespect for it have been adopted, as well as a declaration of sovereignty. This declaration, so the congress of left bank deputies in Tiraspol believes, is unacceptable, first because it does not recognize USSR citizenship for the inhabitants of the republic, declares Moldova's right to ratify Union laws, declares Moldova a demilitarized zone, and stipulates its membership not of the USSR but of "the community of sovereign states." The left bank also fundamentally disagrees with parliament's assessment of the events of 1940, connected with the sending of Soviet troops into Bessarabia and the creation of the Moldavian SSR.

But the deputies of the Dnestr cities probably see as their biggest grievance the language laws adopted a year ago, which encroach on "the political and civil rights of representatives of other nationalities." They believe that the current language regulations "threaten the region's economy with the loss of specialist cadres," since economic leaders are required to master the state language within a few years. Sharp objections are provoked by the nationalization of industries under Union jurisdiction and the Moldovan government's policy in the economic sphere in general, which is assessed in Tiraspol as voluntarist, threatening the region and the republic with disaster. Hence it was stated that the left bank no longer has a common path with such a Moldova.

The session in Kishinev was still continuing when the declaration was adopted in Tiraspol on the formation of the Dnestr Moldavian SSR, composed of five rayons and four cities. Tiraspol is designated its capital. A provisional committee will exercise all supreme power until the elections, while executive power will be exercised by a republican ispolkom [executive committee] with the status of a council of ministers. Subordinate to this will be 12 administrations and committees, including committees of internal affairs and state security. It has been decided to set up subunits of a patrol-guard service and enlist volunteers for them, and to draft some young people for military service into the Ministry of Internal Affairs Internal Troops stationed in the Dnestr region. The operation of the Constitution and the laws of the Moldovan SSR is terminated, and only Union laws are now recognized. Other documents were also adopted—on preparing a Dnestr Moldavian SSR Constitution, on enterprise ownership, a republican bank, and on a press organ, as well as a decree on power and an appeal to the United Nations and to USSR President M. Gorbachev.

Only a few hours were to pass before the resolution on the Dnestr Moldavian SSR was annulled as unlawful by the Moldovan SSR Supreme Soviet session. And although parliamentary deputies learned the details of this congress only in the evening, the atmosphere in the hall during the day was red hot. The second attempt in the last 15 days to violate Moldova's geographical integrity provoked sharp protest from parliament, where that day the Gagauz deputies and most of the left bank deputies were absent. The session was relayed by radio, and naturally the republic's entire population was glued to their receivers. It was also busy in the approaches to the building.

The legal nihilism, which has become the norm for the left bank and the rayons with a Gagauz population, carries with it a danger to the very existence of the state of Moldova—these words were heard especially often from the rostrum. If you are building a rule-of-law state, you cannot tolerate the infringement of laws that have only just been adopted—a society is corrupted by disrespect. Therefore, tough measures of a very resolute kind are needed to combat lawlessness, up to and including the application of articles of the Criminal Law and expulsion of separatists from Moldova. A national army is needed—and as quickly as possible—to defend sovereignty and territory. It is essential also to introduce without delay into the republic a presidential system of government, which would make the executive power mobile and efficient. These proposals, which were heard in the report and in speeches, were approved by the hall. Direct accusations resounded many times from the session's rostrum against certain forces who are directing the separatists' actions from the center and making Moldova a pawn in the political game. An example was cited: the batallion of Internal Troops sent to Tiraspol by the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs leadership to guard the congress and maintain order. This action was interpreted as a gross violation of Moldova's sovereignty. A group of USSR people's deputies sent a protest

statement to the country's president. The speakers in the debates saw "parvenus"—the major economic leaders of the Dnestr region who are trying to prevent the destatization and nationalization of Union enterprises—as the inspirers of separatism.

Separatism cannot be tolerated, but there should be no bloodshed in the battle to preserve Moldova's unity—the deputies, happily, called this to mind increasingly often toward the end of the session. The knots of interethnic conflicts cannot be untangled by punishments and compulsion alone; political methods of persuasion are also necessary. It is necessary to take account of historical realities such as the ethnic composition of the left bank population, and to help them realize the benefits of the changes taking place in Moldova. This should be the task of parliamentary groups in the localities.

At the morning session on Monday a law was adopted on the institution of the post of Moldovan SSR president, to be elected for five years by all the citizens of the republic. The law stipulated that the first president be elected by the Supreme Soviet in an open vote. Among the president's powers is the right to institute presidential rule and dissolve local soviets that violate the Constitution and do not implement the laws of the republic.

On the same day a resolution "On the Military Service of Citizens of the Moldovan SSR" was adopted. The republic government was instructed to begin talks with the Union government about the return to Moldova of those of its citizens who are taking part in settling interethnic conflicts in other regions of the country, to continue their military service there. Also to discuss Moldova's young people carrying out their service on the territory of Moldova, the formation of a national army, and the introduction of alternative forms of service.

Moldavian Supreme Soviet Resumes Session 8 Sep

LD0809103990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 8 Sep 90

[Text] The emergency session of the Moldova Soviet Socialist Republic resumed today. It is discussing reports by the leaders of groups of deputies which have been studying the situation which has arisen in the southern and left-bank regions of Moldova following the proclamation of the Gagauz and Dnestr republics.

Internal Affairs Minister on Carabinieri Corps

PM0709093290 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Sep 90 Second Edition p 6

[TASS report on interview with Moldavian Internal Affairs Minister I. Kostash, by TASS correspondent V. Gondusov; place and date not given: "The Carabinieri—Who Are They?"]

[Text] As has been reported, on 4 September the government of the Moldova SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] adopted a decision on the formation of a corps of carabinieri [karabinery] under the republic's MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs]. TASS correspondent V. Gondusov asked Major General I. Kostash, Moldova SSR minister of internal affairs, to comment on the government decision.

[Kostash] "The staffing of the corps of carabinieri will be mixed—both professionals (30-40 percent) and people drawn from among servicemen on compulsory service who have been drafted from the republic. The corps is to take the place of the USSR MVD Internal Troop units currently stationed on the republic's territory.

"Several hundred people have already submitted applications to join the corps of carabinieri. We are giving preference to young people who have served in the airborne assault, border, or Internal Troops, and also Afghan veterans. Nationality is of no importance, but we are, of course, giving preference to natives of the republic who know its state language.

"As for the officer corps, we propose to petition the USSR Defense Ministry to send natives of the Moldova SSR to the republic to continue their service.

"We realize that it will not be easy for the republic to maintain the corps of carabinieri. According to specialists' calculations, it will cost hundreds of millions of rubles a year."

Joint Ukrainian-Russian Statement Issued

LD0809070190 Kiev International Service in Ukrainian 1800 GMT 6 Sep 90

[Text] People's deputies of the Ukraine, the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] and the USSR, having met at the initiative of the Narodna Rada of the Ukraine [opposition group in parliament] and the parliamentary bloc Democratic Russia, have worked out and adopted a joint statement on the principles of interstate relations between the Ukraine and the RSFSR on the basis of their declarations of state sovereignty. We offer to you, esteemed listeners, a summary of this document.

The history of the two great peoples of the Ukraine and Russia, the statement says, is filled with dramatic events that did not foster the establishment of equal relations between them. The state rights of the Ukraine, which were endorsed by Tsar Aleksey Mikhaylovich in 1654 in the treaty called Articles of Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky, and also asserted in the fourth act of the Ukrainian Central Rada in 1918 concerning the creation of an independent, free, and sovereign state of the Ukrainian people—the Ukrainian People's Republic—were crushed by the tsarist and Bolshevik regimes. The treaty on the creation of the Soviet Union in 1922 virtually eliminated the state independence of both the Ukraine and Russia, and laid the foundations for the Stalinist empire, which became a concentration camp for all the peoples it encompassed. The totalitarian system and the imperial policies of the USSR leadership inflicted great

harm upon our peoples and led to an economic crisis, as well as to a moral and physical degradation.

The history of our peoples also contains bright pages of friendship and mutual assistance such as, for example, the joint struggle against Hitlerite fascism and against the Stalinist tyranny for the triumph of democratic ideals. We are in favor of all the best historical traditions in the mutual relations and links between the peoples of Ukraine and Russia being fostered and developed in every possible way.

It is precisely now, when the democratic movement directed against the compromised party-state system is growing in our republics, that the peoples of the Ukraine and Russia have a real chance to open a new page in the history of the relations between them. The declarations on the state sovereignity of the Ukraine and the RSFSR, which have been adopted this year, are the founding documents reflecting the will of the peoples of the Ukraine and the RSFSR to create their own sovereign democratic states. The implementing of the principles listed in these declarations must be the main aim in the activities of the new organs of power in the Ukraine and in the RSFSR.

The participants in the meeting believe that the interstate relations between the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the RSFSR should be called [word indistinct]—that is, the unconditional recognition by the Ukraine of the Russian Federation, and the latter's recognition of the Ukraine as sovereign states subject to international law. It includes the sovereign equality of sides:

—noninterference in each other's internal affairs;

—renunciation of the use of force or of economic and other methods of pressure that are incompatible with the principles of international law;

—the inviolability of existing state borders between the Ukraine and the RSFSR, and repudiation of any territorial pretensions;

—ensuring the political, economic, ethnic, and cultural rights of representatives of all nations and ethnic groups in the RSFSR who live on the territory of the Ukraine, and those of the Ukraine on the territory of the RSFSR;

—fostering humanitarian assistance and the solution to problems arising from unswerving observance of human rights as proclaimed in the General Human Rights Declaration, in the Helsinki and Vienna accords, and in other international legal acts;

—mutually advantageous cooperation in the economic, ecological, scientific-technical, cultural, humanitarian, informational, and other fields on the basis of interstate agreements;

—encouragement of direct links between enterprises and organizations;

—settling of any disputable problems in an agreeable spirit.

A special feature of the present-day transitional period derives from the emergence and existence of new political realities—of the independent states of the Ukraine, the Russian Federation, and others. On the other hand there are the obsolete political, economic, state-administrative, military, and other all-Union structures. The main problem of the present-day period is to dismantle them in a painless way, to assert the statehood of republics, and to switch over to a commonwealth of independent states. In order to solve this, talks must be held immediately between republics, and first of all on the following issues:

first, economic and financial relations;

second, armed forces, the military-industrial complex, and the KGB;

third, joint ecological programs—in particular the removal of the consequences of the Chernobyl catastrophe;

fourth, the fuel-power complex, including nuclear power and industry;

fifth, transport and communications;

sixth, the republics' succession to the international treaties and the property of the Soviet Union.

The participants in the meeting believe that solving these and other questions in a spirit of good-neighborly cooperation, friendship, and mutual assistance will constitute a great and constructive stride forward in the development of interstate relations between the Ukraine and the Russian Federation. Cooperation in this form demands the establishment of diplomatic and consular relations between our states, opening in Kiev and Moscow permanent diplomatic missions.

Caucasus

Armenia's New Interior Minister Profiled

NC0609191890 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 4 Sep 90

["Profile of Karlos Bagratovich Kazaryan, Armenian minister of internal affairs"—ARMENPRES headline]

[Text] Yerevan, 4 Sep (ARMENPRES)—K.B. Kazaryan was born in 1940 in Baku. He graduated from Leninakan's No. 15 Armenian intermediary school. He then entered the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry's advanced officers institute in Ordzhonikidze City. After graduation he served in the Internal Service units deployed in Armenia. He graduated the Frunze Military Academy of the USSR Defence Ministry. He returned to Armenia and until 1974 he held various command posts at the Internal Service units.

He was deputy chief of Yerevan City Internal Affairs Department between 1974-75. After that he studied at and graduated from the academy of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry.

He became deputy interior minister of the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic in 1977.

He was chief of Yerevan City Internal Affairs Department between 1983-88. He was then appointed the head of the advanced courses at Yerevan city department of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry.

He was appointed first deputy interior minister of the Armenian Republic in August 1990.

He is married and has a child.

Party Organization Dissolved at Armenian Procuracy

NC0709121790 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 6 Set 90

[Text] The issue of the depoliticization of the central apparatus of the Armenian Republic Procuracy was discussed at the procuracy's primary party organization conference. In line with Article 9 of the declaration of independence in which the Armenian Republic's Supreme Soviet stipulated the depoliticization of the law enforcement organs, the conference unanimously decided to dissolve the primary party organization at the central apparatus of the procuracy of the Armenian Republic and to terminate personal memberships in the CPSU.

Armenian Supreme Soviet To Publish Own Paper

NC0709095690 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 6 Sep 90

[Excerpts] The Armenian Supreme Soviet's session opened today with a debate on forming the standing parliamentary commissions. [passage omitted] A draft resolution on establishing a social-political daily newspaper of the Armenian Republic's Supreme Soviet was presented to the session, which convened after the recess. This draft, presented by the Press Affairs Commission, was endorsed by the Supreme Soviet. It was decided to temporarily appoint Aydin Morikyan as the newspaper's editor and to publish the Armenian Republic's daily newspaper in Armenian and Russian.

When the session reconvened in the evening, the results of the closed and secret votes [on the election of chairmen of the standing commissions] were published. No chairmen were elected to five commissions from among the candidates put forward because none received a majority vote. The only exception was the Press Affairs Commission, where Meruzhan Ter-Gulanyan was elected chairman.

The session will resume deliberations on 10 September.

Tension Continues on Armenia-Azerbaijan Border

Getashen 'Relatively Stable'

NC0709102390 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1800 GMT 6 Sep 90

[Text] The editorial board was informed today that the situation in Shaumyanovskiy and Getashen is relatively stable. As you already know, to the great distress of the Armenian population, armed detachments of the Azerbaijani militia and of the so-called Popular Front invaded Getashen last week with the assistance of army subunits. They conducted illegal searches and tried to force the people to abandon their ancestral homes or submit to arbitrary acts of the Azerbaijanis and state oppression. In Shaumyanovskiy Rayon an attempt was made with the assistance of the army power to abolish the local administration organs, such as the rayon party committee, and to install the Azerbaijani Organizational Committee.

Thanks to the steadfastness of the local Armenians and the resolute stance taken and negotiations conducted in Moscow by the new administration in Armenia, it was possible to ease the tense situation. The armed Azerbaijani groups have been taken out of Getashen, and two helicopter flights went today from Yerevan to Shaumyanovsk.

Communications Cut in NKAO

NC0809063590 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 6 Sep 90

["Report from Stepanakert, 6 September"]

[Excerpts] The decade-long violation of the rights of the Armenian people of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] by Azerbaijan is continuing. The leadership of the neighboring republic is resorting to all kinds of actions, well aware that they mat generate a wave of indignation in Artsakh [NAKO] and Armenia, which in turn would further exacerbate the already complex situation in the region. One gets the impression that Azerbaijan is intentionally trying to instigate Armenians to commit illegal actions on the eve of elections in Azerbaijan. There can be no other explanation for what is taking place in the NKAO under the guise of the defense of the sovereign rights of that republic. Sadly, this is being done with the assistance of the Internal Affairs Ministry Troops in a republic which claims to be civilized.

This time around the focus of the instigatory acts was Stepanakert airport, where an open mockery of Soviet citizens of Armenian origin has been taking place for the last three days.

Today, 6 September, in addition to everything else, the oblast's telephone, cable, and telex connections with the outside world have been completely severed. It was a miracle that a few urgent messages on the situation reached Moscow. This is what they said:

To USSR Internal Affairs Minister Bakatin and the USSR civil aviation minister: On 4 September the Internal Affairs Ministry Troops at Stepnanakert airport impounded a YAK-45 helicopter of the Armenian Civil Aviation Department for no reason. Only at the end of the day and following the intervention of the union departments was it allowed to fly. On 5 September this illegality was repeated and six helicopters were impounded on the orders of the airport commandant who said he was acting on the orders of Ovchinnikov, the interim acting commandant of the state of emergency area. [passage omitted]

[Signed] The pilots of the impounded helicopters: Ashot Chilingaryan, Aleksandr Fiderenko, Ashot Khachaturyan, Samuel Ovanesyan, Garnik Garibyan, and Vrastad Bagdasaryan.

To USSR Internal Affairs Minister Bakatin: Hundreds of passengers are gathered at Stepanakert airport, yet six YAK-40 helicopters have been impounded here by the Internal Troops. According to information we have obtained, you have spoken to Azerbaijani leaders and your subordinates. However, we have the impression that Colonel Ovchinnikov, the interim acting commandant of the state of emergency area, is obeying not Bakatin but Polyanichko. [passage omitted]

[Signed] USSR People's Deputies Zori Balayan, Vachakan Grigoryan, Vaan Gaprielyan, Boris Dadamyan, and Genrik Pogosyan.

USSR People's Deputies from the NKAO Semyon Babayan, chairman of the executive committee of the oblast party committee; Maksim Mirzoyan, chairman of the executive committee of Stepanakert City Party Committee; and Valeriy Atadzhanyan, first secretary of Stepanakert City Party Committee, have sent a cable to Pervyshin, USSR minister of communications, which reads: Because of the failure to take effective measures against those who cut the NKAO's telephone and cable lines to the outside world for a week in January 1990, this illegal action has now been repeated. Since 4 September, the NKAO has been without means of communicating with Moscow, Armenia, and other cities. This antistate stance of the Azerbaijani communications organs manifests itself in the blockade of all road and air routes [words indistinct]. Sadly, our numerous appeals to the relevant Union organs have produced no results. It is hard to believe that the USSR Communications Ministry's leadership is not in a position to bring its subordinates in Azerbaijan in line. The population of the NKAO is deeply indignant over the criminal acts of the Azerbaijani leadership, which aim to further destabilize the situation in the region. We demand that you personally take urgent and effective measures to restore communications between the NKAO and the outside world and to preclude the repetition of such a barbarity. By so doing you will help avert a tragic conclusion to these incidents. [Words indistinct] there is growing impression that Azerbaijan has declared its sovereignty so that it will be able to violate the basic rights of the Armenians of the NKAO with impunity. Let us add that for the last three days no freight cars have arrived at the Stepanakert railway station and only a two-day supply of bread remains. The NKAO is now virtually under siege.

Militia's Call to Arms Assailed

NC0709124090 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 6 Sep 90

[Statement by the Armenian Republic's Supreme Soviet Commission for the Establishment of Independent Statehood and National Policy—recorded]

[Text] The Armenian Revolutionary Federation's [ARF] responsible organ in Armenia made an appeal on the Armenian television news on 5 September in which it called on the Armenian people to rise up to defend Artsakh [Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast]. That appeal, which contained striking statements and emotive patriotic expressions, not only does not help to solve the problem but also further exacerbates it and will lead to an Armenian-Azerbaijani armed confrontation.

The newly established organ of ARF in Armenia is assuming responsibilities like this which no one has given it. Armenia's behavior in the current situation should be decided exclusively by its authorities.

The ARF should also realize that the Armenian Supreme Soviet is resorting to every step to shift the solution of the problem from the sphere of confrontation to the sphere of negotiations in order to avoid meaningless bloodshed. Aside from the fact that ARF's appeal is incompatible with the policy adopted by the authorities, the appeal also destabilizes the already grave situation in Armenia. For example, the appeal calls on the national armed formations to press the fatherland's leadership to take measures to defend Artsakh and the border regions. Not only do such calls and statements not contribute to the stabilization of the situation, but they instead create unnecessary panic among the people, who have already gathered around the newly formed state organs and expect solutions to the problems perturbing them from these organs alone.

[Signed] Commission Chairman Ktrich Sardaryan.

Ministry Issues Statement

NC0709183590 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 6 Sep 90

["Statement by the Armenian Internal Affairs Ministry"]

[Text] On 5 September 17 crimes were committed in Armenia. Twelve of these took place in Yerevan. (?Four) incidents of theft of state and personal property, one case of bodily injury and 10 cases of stolen vehicles—eight in Yerevan—have taken place. Eight road accidents took place, resulting in 10 injured and two killed.

Asadurov, a criminal sought throughout the Union, was arrested in Kalininskiy Rayon after committing a crime; and Nersisyan, sought locally, was arrested in Oktemberyanskiy Rayon.

Seven home made hand grenades were turned in to the authorities in Yerevan. Also, 22 stolen cars were found and returned to their owners.

Four out of 10 helicopters which flew to Stepanakert from Yerevan on 5 September have been returned to Erebuni airport and the six remaining have been illegally impounded by the Azerbaijani authorities. Because of this illegal action, flights to Vladikafkas, Sukhumi, Batumi, Stavropol and Groznyy have been disrupted.

The Armenian population is indignant at the impediments which the Azerbaijani side artificially creates by using the USSR Internal Troop subunits deployed in Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast. The Armenian Internal Affairs Ministry leadership is exerting efforts to normalize the (?flight) situation and to ensure the necessary amount of flights.

Catholicos Speaks on Conflict

NC0709183690 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1800 GMT 6 Sep 90

[Excerpts] The Catholicos of all the Armenians, Vazgen I spoke on Armenian television yesterday. His speech has been published in the today's press. He said: With the declaration of the Armenian Republic as an independent and free national state we find ourselves at a new phase in our centuries-old turbulent history. [passage omitted] We hope for a peaceful cooperation to develop between the union of sovereign republics and between the nationalities of Transcaucasia based on truth and justice and on the demands of human rights and national self-determination.

We are convinced that the enforcement of these principles will enable us to find a just solution to the the natural and legal demands of the Armenian population of Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast to freely determine its destiny. Moved by these principles it is necessary to evade at all costs a bloody interethnic confrontation which cannot benefit anyone.

Armenian Shepherds Killed

LD0709143290 Moscow TASS in English 1331 GMT 7 Sep 90

[By ARMENPRES-TASS correspondent Dzhivan Balagezyan]

[Text] Yerevan September 7 TASS—Two shepherds in Armenia's Goris area were brutally murdered last night by unidentified men who drove their herd—up to 150 head of cattle from the high-altitude village of Khoznavar—towards the adjacent Lachin district or Azerbaijan.

Gangs operating out of the neighboring republic have assumed a much higher profile lately, raiding Armenian border villages almost every night. During just three recent days—on September 2, 3 and 4—they stole more than 1,000 cows and sheep from Armenia.

The Armenian Interior Ministry demanded that the Soviet Interior Ministry step up security in the broder zone.

General Says Arms Not Being Smuggled From Iran

90US1295A Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian 21 Aug 90 p 3

[Report on interview with Major General V.I. Lilin, deputy chief of troops of the Red Banner Transcaucasus Border District, by AZERINFORM correspondents A. Guseynov and E. Ali-Zade; place and date not specified: "Arms Are Not Getting Across the Border"]

[Text] **During the events that occurred on the Soviet-Iranian border last December and at the beginning of this year, more than 160 kilometers of barrier installations and a control zone were dismantled in a sector of the Azerbaijan SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]. One of the motives for this action was the requirement to simplify border crossing procedures for residents of the border rayons and to raise the "iron curtain" that for decades had not permited contacts between friends and relatives who ended up on different sides of the border by virtue of historical fate. To this day, these events are whipped up in reports in the Armenian mass media, which are simultaneously supported by central newspapers, and are presented as the reason behind the flow of arms organized in Azerbaijan for the purpose of establishing a "steady channel" to equip extremist groups and various formations that are not envisaged in legislation. AZERINFORM correspondents asked Major General V.I. Lilin, deputy chief of the troops of the Red Banner Transcaucasus Border District, to report on the present situation on the Soviet-Iranian border and to what extent information on the entry of arms from Iran into Azerbaijan is true.**

[Lilin] It should be admitted, of course, that in comparison with past years, today's border troops are experiencing significantly increasing physical and moral demands. Various violations of state border procedures are taking place, and there are cases of transporting contraband. But, in comparison with January of this year, the situation has stabilized, and the border troops, despite the aforementioned difficulties, are once again guaranteeing the inviolability of our frontiers.

And if at first, after the well-known events, the leading reason for contacts across the border was the search for relatives, then people now are motivated basically by commercial interests. However, there are no data to indicate that the results of these contacts are organized purchases and deliveries of arms across the border into the Azerbaijan SSR. Moreover, this is true not only with the border troops but with other organs as well. At the beginning of this year, there were only two cases in which

attempts were made to smuggle one pistol and one automatic weapon into our territory. With full responsibility, I declare that there is no system, large-scale and organized, for the delivery of arms from Iran to Azerbaijan. In this connection, the leadership of the Armenian SSR was notified that the border is being guarded in such a way that there have been no uncontrolled shipments and transmission of arms and that there cannot be any. Moreover, we proposed that they send their representatives to verify on the spot the status of the guarding of the border and the possibility of sending arms across it. We have not gotten an answer from them yet.

Our chief concern is caused by the increase in the scale of smuggling transactions in dry goods for popular consumption and industrial commodities, which are being engaged in more frequently not only by residents of the Iranian side, but also by those living in the Soviet border area. Moreover, while previously the smuggling had the nature of a gift, now it is more and more taking on the character of a trade with corresponding volumes of illegal shipments. Especially disturbing is the appearance of an assortment of drug contraband from Iran, and from our country—strong alcoholic beverages. There were also cases of attempts to bribe border guards.

Here, then, is what the border service has accomplished in the first half of this year: A large amount of goods that are in short supply in our country was confiscated from smugglers—700 electric shavers, 22,000 electric light bulbs, about one thousand pairs of pantyhose and 3,000 head scarfs, 1,600 meters of fabric, and more than 4,000 table settings of various kinds. Also encountered in the contraband are television sets, washing machines, and spare parts for automobiles and motorcycles. Of the contraband commodities that came from Iran, more than 4,000 packs of chewing-gum and henna, more than 600 packages of "Marlboro" cigarettes, and about 10,000 electronic watches were confiscated. There were also tape recorders, video tape recorders, telephone sets, etc. The value of the confiscated contraband amounts to millions of rubles, and this is the direct damage that could be inflicted on the state border trade.

[BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY] Vyacheslav Ivanovich, and what are the relations like between the local population and the border guards at the present time?

[Lilin] The border troops have always had a strong friendship with the local population. And now our mutual relations with them are being restored. We once again, as before, are feeling their real help.

In the period that has passed since the events, much has been done so that the population would more fully utilize the land areas behind the line of border installations. In pertinent decrees of the Councils of Ministers of the Azerbaijan SSR and the Nakhichevan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, areas are indicated that are suitable for land use and are distributed between farms. We have significantly simplified the system of access to this land. But here also there are persons who are trying to use these opportunities to establish some kind of contact with the other side, including for the purpose of smuggling contraband. But these are isolated cases. On the whole, the local population is really conscientiously working on these lands.

We are also rearranging our mutual relations with the population, we are democratizing them, and we are undertaking measures so that the border posts are not closed places, alienated from the concerns and hopes of the residents. We understand that the closer we are to the people and the more fully we live for their interests, the stronger will be not only our human friendship, but our border as well.

New Parties Registered for Georgia Elections

LD0609214490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1713 GMT 6 Sep 90

[Text] Tbilisi, 6 September (TASS)—TASS correspondent Eduard Ediberidze reports:

The Georgian Supreme Court today decided to register six new parties which the central electoral commission had previously refused to register for the election of deputies to the republic's Supreme Soviet.

They are the Progressive Democratic Party [Progressivno-Demokraticheskaya Partiya], the Labor Party [Trudovaya Partiya], the National Party for a Georgian Demographic Society [Natsionalnaya Partiya Gruzinskogo Demograficheskogo Obshchestva], the Alliance for National Concord and the Rebirth of Georgia [Soyuz Nationalnogo Soglasiya i Vozrozhdeniya Gruzii], the Agrarian Alliance of Georgia [Agrarnyy Soyuz Gruzii], and the Georgian Political Organization "Stalin."

They were granted the right to apply to the court by a new law on elections to the republic's highest organ of state power. These elections are being held on a multiparty basis for the first time in Soviet practice.

Tbilisi Rally Fails To Consolidate Parties

90US1294A Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 12 Aug 90 p 1

[Article by Tengiz Grigalashvili: "Difficult Dialogue in Front of the Microphone"]

[Text] **It would not be an exaggeration to say that all Georgia was excited as it awaited the beginning of the rally announced the day before by the leaders of the Georgian National Independence Party. The purpose of the rally was described in a previously printed declaration signed by Irakliy Tsereteli and Irakliy Batiashvili.**

On the same evening the political parties and associations of the Roundtable were conducting their traditional informative meeting in the square in front of the Government House. The depth of interest in these two actions could be seen not only from the number of participants but also from the record number of mass

media representatives who showed up. The desire to see yesterday's partners together again, after they experienced hardships and privations for the sake of the exalted goal, prevailed this time over all other considerations. Yes, the foundation of the unique edifice of Georgian national-liberation movement did crack and the crack started spreading threateningly along its load-bearing wall. First in a low voice and then louder and louder the sinister word "schism" was being pronounced. It brought confusion to the hearts of the people who are totally incapable of putting up a wall between their sons who signed up to be pioneers on the way to freedom and independence. LITERATURULI SAKARTVELO published an article by author Guram Petriashvili filled with the realization of how unacceptable it is to let political differences transform into personal insults; it was filled with pain and anguish.

And now the meeting in Rustaveli Square started. No, there was no exultant joy there; tense anticipation reigned in the square. Irakliy Tsereteli spoke to the people; he briefly outlined the political atmosphere in Georgia and described in detail the situation within the liberation movement, characterizing it as dangerous. It was necessary to take urgent measures, he said, to prevent further growth of the conflict. The National Independence Party of Georgia suggests that a meeting between the Roundtable representatives and the coordinating center be organized so that they could clarify each other's positions at the negotiating table. We can differ in our opinions but we all pursue a common goal. Therefore, it might be reasonable to set up a single center of the national-liberation movement which will coordinate the actions of various political and public movements.

Later the participants went towards the Government House and joined the meeting there. Irakliy Tsereteli stood near the microphone, almost side by side with Zviad Gamsakhurdiya. There was only one man standing between them and the desire of those present to see them together must have been so great that somebody could not wait any longer and said angrily: "You, step aside! Can you not understand?"

As I already said, it was an informative meeting. Among the speakers there were Zviad Gamsakhurdiya, Teymuraz Koridze, Guram Petriashvili, Amiran Kaladze, our compatriot from France Shalva Takaishvili, Bidzina Giorgobiani, Gizo Gelovani, etc. All of them, as well as other speakers, touched upon a wide range of problems but I would not be mistaken to say, I think, that the most crucial problems were the future elections to the Supreme Soviet of Georgia and the liquidation of the conflict situation. It goes without saying that there were reproaches and rejection of certain issues in the speeches. The majority of the participants even voted against the suggestion of the National Independence Party to organize a meeting around a negotiating table. But still, the first step has been made in this direction, I think, and I would like to believe that others will follow. As for some separate moments of confrontation at this joint meeting, I omit them deliberately. We have to turn our special attention to things that unite us around our lofty goal but not to things that separate us. I am sure that my opinion is shared even by those who, for various reasons, do not yet think that it is possible to consolidate all the forces of the national liberation movement.

Electoral Bloc Leader Cites Independence Aim

PM0709115790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 3

[INTERFAX report: "Election Campaign in Georgia"]

[Text] The formation and registration of the electoral blocs which Georgia's 30-odd political parties and social organizations may join will have been completed by 18 September. Parliamentary elections will be held in the republic 28 October. To date, an INTERFAX correspondent reports, three party blocs have been formed: the "Democratic Georgia" bloc formed around the Ilya Chavchavadze Society, advocating liberal democratic ideas; the "Roundtable"—a group of parties led by Zviad Gamsakhurdiya; and the "Bloc of Four," which notably includes Georgia's "Greens."

In an interview with our correspondent, Zviad Gamsakhurdiya stated that the electoral bloc he heads opposes the Georgian Communist Party. In Gamsakhurdiya's words, the "Roundtable" is counting on winning a considerable number of seats in the republic's future parliament. "If this happens," he stressed, "we will pursue a policy of protecting the Georgian people's sovereign rights. We also advocate the examination on a broad democratic basis of the issue of Georgian independence, and the creation of a legal mechanism for restoring our statehood."

Gumbaridze, Gamsakhurdia Interviewed on Strike

90US1297A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 35, 1-7 Sep 90 pp 6-7

[Report on interview with G. Gumbaridze, chairman of the Presidium of the Georgian Supreme Soviet and first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party, and Z. Gamsakhurdia, chairman of the Helsinki Union of Georgia, by ARGUMENTY I FAKTY correspondent D. Davitiani; place and date not given: "Concession or Firm Position?.."]

[Text] Tbilisi—**Our correspondent asked G. Gumbaridze, chairman of the Georgian Supreme Soviet and first secretary of the Central Committee of the Georgian Communist Party, and Z. Gamsakhurdia, chairman of the Helsinki Union of Georgia, to answer several questions.**

[Davitiani] How do you assess the current sociopolitical situation in the republic?

[Gumbaridze] It is rather complicated and contradictory. This is caused mainly by the preparations for the elections to the Supreme Soviet of the Georgian SSR

[Soviet Socialist Republic], which will take place for the first time in the country on a multiparty basis. No one yet has any experience in conducting such elections, just as there is no experience in a democratic campaign for parliamentary seats. This causes excessive nervousness in the behavior of some sociopolitical associations and groups, and, as a consequence, destructive actions, attempts to express oneself in the language of ultimatums and threats, reanimation of certain methods from the arsenal of our totalitarian past, claims to a monopoly on the truth, and strong pressure on dissidents and the authorities.

The publication in the press of three alternate draft laws on elections should direct political activity into a constructive channel. If, of course, in this case there is no strong pressure on public opinion and the most active political associations and movements reject unacceptable nonpolitical forms of opposition. We must all understand that the interests of parties and movements in the present stage are secondary—the political will of the people in restoring the state sovereignty of Georgia, which we are all obligated to support rigorously, is primary. The Communist Party of the republic has stated this clearly and unequivocally.

[Gamsakhurdia] The situation is complicated and difficult, and it is aggravated by the conflict between the national movement and the government of Georgia. The reason lies in the natural desire and struggle to hold truly democratic multiparty elections, but in no way like they were earlier. The local government was categorically against the new forms that we proposed. It blocked them in every way, and it interfered in the activity of members of our working commission to create a draft law on elections that is radically different from those that existed earlier. Everything was done to obstruct its publication in the press for general consideration. And, in the end, it was intended to delay for a certain period the holding of a Supreme Soviet session, which was supposed to examine and ratify a draft law. For these reasons we were compelled to resort to an extreme measure—a strike on the railroad in Samtredia. Similar actions were taken in the seaports. A general strike evolved. Only after this did the government make concessions, by publishing three versions of the draft law, one of which was ours. It is true that after this efforts were made to force us to change individual paragraphs and positions, which also caused serious disagreements.

Such an attitude quite simply indicates that neither the center nor the local government want to concede monopoly of authority without a fight. This became especially critically apparent in the republic after G. Gumbaridze returned from the 28th CPSU Congress. The opposition to our lawful demands only exacerbates the existing dispute, and it affects the stabilization of the situation in the republic in the most negative way.

[Davitiani] To what extent did the actions on the Transcaucasus Railroad contribute to the official authorities' renewal of dialogue with the opposition?

[Gumbaridze] Unfortunately, even TASS did not resist the temptation to represent the political resolution of the conflict as a kind of deal between the authorities and the opposition.

No one disrupted the political dialogue in the republic, and no one intended to disrupt it, no matter how certain forces attempted to depict it. A permanent dialogue with other public associations and movements is the normal and natural condition of any political organization that realistically assesses the situation, and I consider the Georgian Communist Party to be precisely such a political party. As for the well-known events on the railroad, they did not fundamentally affect the process of preparing for the session, which was held on 17 August as planned. Three alternate draft laws were published, despite the categorical demands of the opposition to consider only one draft.

[Gamsakhurdia] We do not want and we did not want to harm the population, and also the economy of the republic, but the local government forced us into such an extreme measure. However, the damage is not as great as it is exaggerated. If in the future our demands also do not find and meet proper understanding and support, then we can do nothing else but resort to similar actions and, perhaps, even to other harsher measures.

[Davitiani] What is the outlook for the sociopolitical life of the republic in the near term?

[Gumbaridze] It is difficult to make political predictions in today's situation. One way or another life goes on in the republic, complex socioeconomic problems are being resolved, and, I think, as we move along the emphasis will switch to the daily living needs of the people. So far there have been no important achievements for the better here. The shift to a market economy is inevitable, and the future members of the new parliament, regardless of the model on which they are elected, will encounter colossal problems in the very first days. It is necessary to be prepared for this, and to have at hand a thoroughly analyzed economic program, including the arrangement of equal economic relations with other republics on a new basis. Such work is being carried out in government organs.

The Georgian Communist Party also has clearly defined proposals.

One of the guarantees for the realization of the program proposed by the Communist Party will also be the fact that it unites within its ranks and expresses and defends the interests of representatives of all nationalities that live in Georgia, and that national civil peace and the consolidation and stability of society, as is known, is a very important factor in the positive resolution of all very complex problems.

[Gamsakhurdia] If the political reorganization achieves the proper direction, if free democratic multiparty elections are held, if the Supreme Soviet becomes a truly

national parliament, and if the aspirations of the Georgian people are realized, then the situation will stabilize. All of the urgent national problems, of which there are so many in today's Georgia, will be resolved. Otherwise, a further destabilization could occur.

FROM THE EDITOR. While this material was being readied for the press, another event occurred that aggravated an already tense situation in the republic. The session of the Supreme Soviet of the Abkhaz Autonomous Republic passed a decree concerning legal guarantees for the protection of Abkhaziya and a declaration of its sovereignty. The Presidium of the Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet considered the grounds to be invalid and contradictory to the constitutions of the Abkhaz Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, the Georgian SSR, and the USSR. Commenting on this decree, G. Gumbaridze declared that the decision adopted by the Supreme Soviet of the autonomous republic will be of no benefit to the Georgian, Abkhazian, or other people who live on the territory of Georgia.

Central Asia

Nazarbayev Speaks at Kazakh Presidential Council

LD0809170890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 8 Sep 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] An extended sitting of the Presidential Council of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] took place in Alma-Ata today.

[Correspondent D. Baimbetov] In addition to members of the Presidential Council, members of the Supreme Soviet and the republic's government and representatives of ministries and departments and of various public organisations are also taking part in it. The very important and topical issue of the paths for the economy's transition to market relations and of the republic's economic sovereignty are being discussed. A very lively and committed conversation is under way.

[Kazakh SSR President N.A. Nazarbayev] As is well known, we support a federal organization of the state, but we are in favor of delegating to the center of the Union and Federation only those powers which the supreme authorities of the republic consider it possible to assign for the normal existence of our state. All of the other issues, these are, as we always say, both the land and its minerals, the forests and waters and the riches which we have here and all of the basic reserves which exist on the territory of Kazakhstan including... [changes thought] I am not in agreement with the fact that all of rail transport should be transferred, we consider that the territory—rail transport and communications which pass through the territory—should be republican but there are interrepublican interests and these issues should be resolved in accordance with treaties with the republics.

For this reason, this is an issue of principle. The issue of principle consists of the fact that through many years of history the center and the ministries and departments have created a distorted structure for Kazakhstan's economy—in the shape of the predominance of branches of heavy industry and of the absence of goods for the people. For this reason we have turned out to be under unequal starting conditions prior to the opening of the market. And the Union should take this into account. For this reason Kazakhstan's share—both in a direct and in a figurative sense—in the hard currency and also the diamond and gold riches accumulated in the Union should be obligatory.

It should be taken into account that the living standards of the Kazakh people has been lower than the average in the country as a whole. So we will insist and will work on these principle issues, if one puts it briefly—we could have spoken more.

Supreme Soviet Commission Discusses Osh Report

LD0709202190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 6 Sep 90

[Report by V. Stepanyuk from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpt] One hundred metres from the Kremlin, where our parliament resumes work next week, several inhabitants from Osh Oblast are continuing their hunger strike in the tent village. They are demanding the punishment of those to blame for the mass disorders which took place there this year.

The Supreme Soviet commission for nationalities policy and relations between the nationalities at its routine meeting today discussed a report from a group of people's deputies who had visited the site where the tragic events took place. They also heard reports from Dzhumagulov, chairman of the Council of Ministers of Kirgizia, and from Abramov, deputy procurator general of the USSR, on the reasons for the interethnic conflicts in Osh Oblast. The deputies consider that the main reasons were the violation of social justice, major mistakes, in nationality policy, distortions in the placement of cadres, and criminal passivity of the local authorities in clamping down on the disorders.

The situation in Osh Oblast today is still rather explosive. Although in the opinion of Georgiy Korneyevich Kryuchkov, the leader of the group of deputies, there are, however, positive changes. [passage omitted]

Kryuchkov Explains KGB's Role in Osh Unrest

90US1301A Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian 11 Aug 90 p 1

[Response to CPSU congress delegate's letter by V. Kryuchkov, chairman of the USSR KGB: "Answer to a Question From a Congress Delegate"]

[Text] During the work of the 28th CPSU Congress, R. Safanov, a delegate to the congress and editor of PRAVDA VOSTOKA, sent a letter to the presidium:

"Yesterday Comrade Kryuchkov, chairman of the country's KGB, declared here at the congress that the organs of state security possessed information concerning imminent bloody events in Osh Oblast.

"It must be assumed that the KGB presented the pertinent information either to the president or to the head of the government, but most likely to both leaders. Assuredly the party leaders of Kirghizia were also informed of the carnage that was about to happen. We think that they could not disregard, at the very least they did not have the right to disregard, such grave information.

"Questions arise as to what instructions were given on the subject of averting possible vandalism and to whom? If there were instructions, then how was it possible for such madness to happen? Are there not elements here of a paralysis of authority, or is this irresponsibility bordering on crime?

"I request an answer to these questions. Moreover, I would like to hear a clear and precise position, and not a reference to some kinds of Mafia groups about which so much is said but not one of which has yet been exposed."

Yesterday a letter arrived at the editorial office. We are publishing it without abridgement.

"Dear Ruben Akopovich!

"I fully understand and share your pain and alarm regarding the tragic events in Osh Oblast. I have already had occasion to say that the events in this oblast were not a surprise to the KGB of the Kirghiz SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic], which as early as the beginning of 1990 received warning signals about increasing tension in relations between the Kirghiz and Uzbek populations. Soviet and party organs were repeatedly warned in writing concerning the development of negative processes, and we stated our proposals to normalize the situation by means of political and preventive pressures.

"In particular, at the beginning of April of this year, the Administration of the Kirghiz SSR KGB for Osh Oblast sent a report to the Communist Party of Kirghizia Obkom [Oblast Party Committee] and Oblispolkom [Oblast Soviet Executive Committee] in which it was indicated that persons of Kirghiz nationality planned to organize an action in the city of Osh for the forceful seizure of plots of land. The report contained proposals by chekists to hold precautionary conversations with the initiators of the impending action. Additional information on the evolving situation was sent to the leadership of the oblast and the republic at the end of May of this year. Unfortunately, measures undertaken on the spot to prevent massive disorder were not successful. An investigation is being conducted, and it will answer many questions, including those you have raised.

"The events in Osh Oblast have aroused the grave concern of the leadership of the country. To become acquainted with the situation at the scene and to take measures to normalize the situation, Comrade Ch.T. Aytmatov, a member of the Presidential Council, has departed for the oblast. The meetings of Comrade Aytmatov and members of the delegation he heads with representatives of the Uzbek and Kirghiz population have made it possible to reduce the tension to a certain degree, and they were received in a positive way by residents of the oblast and the people of Kirghizia and Uzbekistan.

"Among the measures proposed to normalize the situation, frequently heard is the necessity of establishing a representative and plenipotentiary commission of Union organs of authority to carry out an objective investigation of the disorders, an analysis of the situation in the region, and the preparation of specific proposals.

"In our view, such a commission can give an objective evaluation of the activities of organs of authority and administration on the prevention and suppression of the tragic events that took place.

[Signed] V. Kryuchkov, chairman of the USSR KGB."

Kryuchkov's KGB Criticized

90US1301B Moscow SOYUZ in Russian No 34, Aug 90 p 17

[Article by SOYUZ correspondent Shakhabutdin Zaynutdinov: "The KGB Washes Its Hands of It"]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] It is difficult not to agree with the opinion of the leader of the most top secret service of the country. At the same time, his answers to the query of the congress delegate raise other questions. The entire statement of the facts is after the fact; i.e.,

after the bloody events occurred. Is it possible that the events in the Transcaucasus, Tajikistan, and Fergana did not serve as a lesson? Because at that time also, KGB workers were informing the leadership. But as for the Osh tragedy, those who are now either removed from work or who continue in authority in spite of everything actually accused the leaders of the organs of the KGB and the Ministry of Internal Affairs in this oblast of alarmism on the day before. Will Comrade Kryuchkov also further direct his subordinates only to write suitable warning reports and at that point to wash their hands of it? This means that there is no guarantee that similar tragedies will not flare up tomorrow in another rayon or region? If those in authority do not listen to the opinions of the Chekists, then I propose that the latter avail themselves of glasnost and, after removing the "top secret" classification from reports, there and then immediately turn to the press, television, and radio. This also will be one of the important warning methods.

Yeltsin Documentry Film Banned in Kirghizia

LD0609165890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 6 Sep 90

[Summary] A documentary film about Yeltsin, "Portrait Against a Backdrop of Struggle," has been banned in Kirghizia's movie theaters. Earlier this year two other films were banned. They are "State of Emergency at District Level" and "We Cannot Live Like This."